Radhakrishnan

RELIGION AND SOCIETY

Radhakrishnan

In these Kamala Lectures delivered in the University of Calcutta in December, 1942, Professor Radhakrishnan discusses the meaning of religion and its application to modern problems of war and peace, family and marriage. He considers Marx's dialectical materialism and Gandhi's non-violence and points out that an enduring peace is possible only if the statesmen of the Allied nations adopt the principles of true religion. The book is invaluable to all students of religion and social thought.

"The product of a deeply religious mind, able to bring the timeless values to bear upon world events, and thus to strengthen faith and hope in the act of being bleakly realistic about the dangers and corruptions of the present."
British Weekly

"Professor Radhakrishnan's work is the fruit of deep religious conviction and a fine philosophical intellect equally at home in East and West."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"A highly stimulating and deeply satisfying book. If one wishes to see the great problems that face mankind today through the eyes of one steeped in both the wisdom of the East and the philosophy of the West, there is probably no one more competent to give us that insight than Professor Radhakrishnan."—*Inquirer*.

Third Impression

INDIAN EDITION
12*s*. 6*d*. net

[illegible]
२१ सितंबर १९५७, शनिवार

Kamala Lectures

RELIGION AND SOCIETY

by Radhakrishnan

AN IDEALIST VIEW OF LIFE

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

THE HINDU VIEW OF LIFE

THE PRINCIPAL UPANIṢADS

EAST AND WEST IN RELIGION

EAST AND WEST

THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ
(Allen & Unwin)

THE DHAMMAPADA
(Oxford University Press)

EASTERN RELIGIONS AND WESTERN THOUGHT
(Clarendon Press, Oxford)

INDIA AND CHINA

IS THIS PEACE?

GREAT INDIANS
(Hind Kitabs, Bombay)

Edited by Radhakrishnan

CONTEMPORARY INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

MAHATMA GANDHI

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY: EASTERN AND WESTERN
(Allen & Unwin)

by A. N. Marlow

RADHAKRISHNAN: AN ANTHOLOGY

RELIGION AND SOCIETY

by

S. RADHAKRISHNAN

London

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1947
SECOND EDITION 1948
THIRD IMPRESSION (SECOND EDITION) 1956

TO

VĀṆĪ

" India in every generation has produced millions of women who have never found fame, but whose daily existence has helped to civilise the race, and whose warmth of heart, self-sacrificing zeal, unassuming loyalty and strength in suffering, when subjected to trials of extreme severity, are among the glories of this ancient race." (pp. 197-198.)

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
in 11 *on* 12 *point Baskerville*
BY BRADFORD AND DICKENS
DRAYTON HOUSE, LONDON, W.C.I

This book is based on Notes of Lectures delivered in the Universities of Calcutta and Benares in the winter of 1942

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

I am taking the opportunity of a second edition to add a Postscript regarding the recent developments in Indian politics.

S. R.

CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

FOUNDER'S LETTER

77, Russa Road North,
Bhowanipore,
Calcutta,
9th February 1924.

To The Registrar,
Calcutta University.

Sir,

I desire to place at the disposal of my University Government Securities for Rupees Forty Thousand only of the 3 per cent. loan with a view to establish a lectureship, to be called the *Kamala Lectureship*, in memory of my beloved daughter (*b.* 18th April 1895—*d.* 4th January 1923). The Lecturer, who will be annually appointed by the Senate, will deliver a course of not less than three lectures, either in Bengali or in English, on some aspect of Indian Life and Thought, the subject to be treated from a comparative standpoint.

The following scheme shall be adopted for the lectureship:

(1) Not later than the 31st March every year a Special Committee of five members shall be constituted as follows:

One member of the Faculty of Arts to be nominated by the Faculty.

One member of the Faculty of Science to be nominated by the Faculty.

One member to be nominated by the Council of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

One member to be nominated by the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad.

One member to be nominated by the Founder or his representatives.

(2) The Special Committee, after such enquiry as they may deem necessary, shall, not later than the 30th June, draw up a report recommending to the Senate the name of a distinguished scholar. The report shall specify the subject of the proposed lectures and shall include a brief statement of their scope.

(3) The report of the Special Committee shall be forwarded to the Syndicate in order that it may be laid before the Senate for confirmation not later than the 31st July.

(4) The Senate may, for specified reasons, request the Special Committee to reconsider their decision, but shall not be competent to substitute another name for the one recommended by the Committee.

(5) The Lecturer appointed by the Senate shall deliver the lectures at the Senate House not later than the month of January next following.

(6) The Syndicate shall, after the lectures are delivered in Calcutta, arrange to have them delivered in the original or in a modified form in at least one place out of Calcutta and shall, for this purpose, pay such travelling allowance as may be necessary.

(7) The honorarium of the Lecturer shall consist of a sum of Rupees one thousand in cash and a Gold Medal of the value of Rupees two hundred only. The honorarium shall be paid only after the lectures have been delivered and the Lecturer has made over to the Registrar a complete copy of the lectures in a form ready for publication.

(8) The lectures shall be published by the University within six months of their delivery, and after defraying the cost of publication the surplus sale proceeds shall be paid to the Lecturer, in whom the copyright of the lectures shall vest.

(9) No person who has once been appointed a Lecturer shall be eligible for re-appointment before the lapse of five years.

Yours faithfully,

ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE.

Lecture I

THE NEED FOR RELIGION

The Present Crisis—The Social Distemper—War and the New Order—Secularism is the Chief Weakness of our Age—Dialectical Materialism—The Need for Spiritual Revival.

May I at the outset express my cordial gratitude to the members of the Senate of the Calcutta University for all the privileges they accorded me during the twenty years of my active association with the University, including the election to the Kamala Lectureship? To be called upon to carry on the distinguished tradition associated with this Lectureship is an honour of which any scholar can be proud. To me, especially, it is a matter of great rejoicing that I should be privileged to speak on a foundation established by the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee in the name of his dear daughter.

"Some aspect of Indian Life and Thought to be treated from a comparative standpoint" is the large theme set to us, and we can interpret it in a liberal way. The subject I have chosen, social reconstruction in the light of religious ideals, seems to me of great importance in these difficult times.

Aurangzeb, in a letter to his tutor Mulla Sahe, writes: "You told my father Shah Jehan that you would teach me philosophy. 'Tis true, I remember very well, that you have entertained me for many years with airy questions of things that afford no satisfaction at all to the mind and are of no use in humane society, empty notions and mere fancies that have only this in them, that they are very hard to understand and very easy to forget. . . . Have you ever taken any care to make me learn what 'tis to besiege a town, or to set an army in array? For these things I am obliged to others, not at all to you." [1] One of my aims in these lectures will be to suggest that if the world is today in a perilous condition, it is because it knows all about "besieging a town" or "setting an army in array" and little about the central questions of the values of life, of philosophy and religion, which it brushes aside as "empty notions and mere fancies."

[1] *A Treasury of the World's Great Letters*, ed. by M. Lincoln Schuster (1941), pp. 90-91.

The Present Crisis

We are at one of the most decisive moments in the life of mankind. At no other period of human history were so many people bearing such impossible burdens or suffering such agonising persecution and anguish of heart. We are living in a world in which tragedy is universal. There is a startling relaxing of traditions, of restraints and of established law and order. Ideas which until yesterday were regarded as inseparable from social decency and justice, which were able to direct and discipline conduct for centuries, are swept away. The world is rent by misunderstandings, bitterness and strife. The atmosphere is charged with suspicion, uncertainty and much fear for the future. The growing distresses of our race, the deepening economic misery, wars on an unprecedented scale, the divided counsels in high places and the inertia of those in power and authority, who wish to preserve the collapsing order and save the crippled civilisation at any cost,[1] are rousing, the world over, a spirit which is, in essence, revolutionary. The term 'revolution' need not always imply mob-violence and massacre of ruling classes. Any urgent desire for intense and drastic change of the foundations of civilised life is a revolutionary desire. The word is used in two senses: (i) a sudden and violent uprising resulting in a *coup* such as the French or the Bolshevik Revolution; (ii) a gradual transition spread over a period of time from one system of social relations to another as, for example, the British Industrial Revolution. What makes a period revolutionary is not the fact of change, which is always present in history, but the pace of change. The present age is revolutionary because the rate of change is very rapid. Everywhere round about us we hear the sound of things breaking, of changes in the social, in the political and economic institutions, in the dominant beliefs and ideas, in the fundamental categories of the human mind. Men of intelligence, sensitiveness and enterprise are convinced that there is something radically wrong with the present arrangements and institutions in regard to politics, economics and industry, and that we must get rid of them if we are to save humanity.

Scientists tell us of the various ways in which the earth may perish. It may be destroyed by the approaching moon at some

[1] Cp. Burke, who says that revolutions are produced not by those who lack power but by those who, holding power, make bad use of it.

remote time or by the cooling of the sun. A comet may strike the earth or a poisonous gas exude from the earth itself. But all these are remote possibilities, while the probabilities are that the human race may perish by its own deliberate acts, by the stupidity and selfishness which are strongly enthroned in human nature. It is tragic that, in a world which is there for us to enjoy and which might be made full of happiness for everyone, if only we are prepared to spend a fraction of the energies which are now given to the perfection of war machinery,[1] we let death and destruction go on. A blind impulse to destroy seems to have taken possession of mankind, and, if there is no check to it, we will take a long stride towards final extinction and prepare for an era of intellectual darkness and ethical barbarism in which man's noblest accomplishments of the past would be laid waste. The tragedy of it oppresses us all with the weight of a physical burden, paining our minds and troubling our hearts. We live in a period of agonising strain, of grave anxiety, of manifold disillusionment. The world is in a condition of trance.

The witness of a few noble souls to a finer world is our hope for the future. In recent decades, we have had not only material development which is striking and visible to the eye, but also a definite growth in ethical sense and social passion. There is an increased desire to apply the results of science and invention to the improvement of the general conditions of life. In our ideas of the relations and obligations of man to man there is a very real advance. The crusade against child labour, factory legislation, old age pensions, compensations for accidents are a few illustrations of the growing sense of responsibility in the community towards every one of its members. Never before in the history of the world has there been such a deep desire for peace and such a widespread hatred of war. The unvindictive courage, the unpretentious self-sacrifice of millions in this war point to the growth of the moral sense and love of humanity.

What is happening today is something that far transcends the fate of any one country, Great Britain or Germany, U.S.S.R. or U.S.A. It is a vast convulsion of society as a whole. It is not a mere war, but a world revolution of which the war is a phase, a major alteration in the entire thought and structure of civilisation, a crisis that goes to the very roots of our civilisation. History has

[1] Cp. Samuel Butler: "All animals except man know that the object of life is to enjoy it."

launched our generation into such an epoch and we must try to guide the revolution to the service of proper ideals. We cannot reverse the course of the revolution. The old order, the order which is the parent of Hitlers, Mussolinis and Tojos, is doomed. Those who fight against them must realise that they are laying the foundations here and now of the new order of liberty. Our enemies are to be put down simply because they still cling to the old and do not help us to clear the path for the new. The cowardly inertness of the human mind must be checked if we wish to win the peace and prevent planting seeds of future disasters. To secure an enduring peace, we must eliminate the conditions which make for wars and be earnest about a new way of life which will mean the sacrifice of cherished idols. So far as we can, we must make sure that we do not allow the fury of combat, the strain of suffering, the resentment at aggression, to warp our just judgment about our foes. We must learn to observe humanity even towards the inhumane, keep our mind on the distant future and not cloud its prospects by insensate hatred.

The world stands at the crossroads, faced by two alternatives: organisation of it as one whole or periodic wars. We make the society in which we live. We are the masters of the institutions which have taken a wrong turn and we must discover the necessary remedies for this sick society. If the civilisation which, till recently, rejoiced in its progress and humanity is now convulsed in agony, it does not mean that it is being hurried by an inexorable process of history to its own dissolution. Periods of creation have been periods of great suffering.[1] The world will pass through a phase of growing-pains before it reaches a new equilibrium. Even though there may be set-backs and relapses, the human race is bound to move towards a saner world. But the pace is set by our courage and wisdom. Constructive purposes which might lead to the re-

[1] Cp. " Modern man is a culmination, but tomorrow he will be surpassed ; he is indeed the end product of an age-old development, but he is at the same time the worst conceivable disappointment of the hopes of human kind. The modern man is aware of this. He has seen how beneficent are science, technology and organisation, but also how catastrophic they can be. He has likewise seen that well-meaning governments have so thoroughly paved the way for peace on the principle, ' in the time of peace prepare for war.' The Christian Church, the brotherhood of man, international social democracy and the ' solidarity ' of economic interests have all failed to stand the baptism of fire—the test of reality. . . . At bottom, behind every such palliative measure, there is a gnawing doubt. On the whole I believe I am not exaggerating when I say that modern man has suffered an almost fatal shock, psychologically speaking, and as a result has fallen into profound uncertainty."—C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, E.T. (1933), pp. 230-31.

demption of the race are often wasted, not through lack of emotion or will but through confusion of mind and timidity.

The Social Distemper

The serious distemper of our social life is traceable to the lag between our social institutions and the world purpose. Nature has made many races with different languages, religions and social traditions, and has set man the task of creating order in the human world and discovering a way of life by which different groups can live peaceably together without resorting to force to settle their differences. The world is not intended to be a battleground of warring nations, but a commonwealth of different groups co-operating in a constructive effort to achieve dignity, noble living and prosperity for all.

The necessary conditions for world union are available; only the will of man is lacking. The great causes of divisions, oceans and mountains, have ceased to operate. Through the facilities of transport and communication now available, the world has become a close neighbourhood. Unlike religion and custom, which are local in character, science recognises no political or social boundaries and speaks a language which is understood by all. The impact on man of the machine has shattered the pre-machine world of entirely independent states. The industrial revolution has affected economic relations so completely that we have become a world society with a world economy which calls for a world order. Science reveals identical cosmic elements as the basis of human life. Philosophy visualises a universal consciousness at the back of nature and humanity. Religion refers to our common spiritual struggles and aspirations.

In the early stages of human evolution, expressions of group thought and feeling took their rise and carried on their development in circumstances which led naturally to mutual isolation and unawareness. The nation state came into being when man felt the necessity of a reliable social order and a strong central power which would put down tribal feuds and civil wars. It served humanity in the past by giving the nationals a spaciousness and creativity not otherwise capable of being attained. Many nations have managed to attain national unity, and it will only be carrying this process a stage further to achieve the unity of the world. Human roots go deeper than the fibres of race and nationality. Our planet has grown too small for parochial patriotism. Historical backgrounds,

climatic conditions, widespread intermarriage have made the different races what they are today. We all have the same mental processes, the same emotional reactions, the same basic impulses and the same longings and aspirations. Darwin in his *Descent of Man* observes: "As man advances in civilisation and small tribes are united into larger communities, the simplest reason would tell each individual that he ought to extend his social instincts and sympathies to all the members of the same nation, though personally unknown to him. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to prevent his sympathies extending to the men of all nations and races." One of the recognised tests of an advance in civilisation is the gradual extension of the boundaries of the group. Darwin would marvel at the talk of racial purity, the exaltation of one breed of men as the chosen favourites of the gods.

The urge of nationalism and its ideals still dominates the thoughts of peoples, whatever be their political faiths, Nazi or Communist, Fascist or Democratic, and thus the energies of men are diverted from the main stream of human progress into narrower channels. We are in the position of primitive groups which embrace the members of the blood kin only, or those with whom they are more or less intimately acquainted. A kind of miseducation to which we are subjected from our nurseries makes us victims of nationalist 'passion.' We look upon baseness, brutality and violence as quite normal if associated with the nation's cause.

Nationalism is not a 'natural' instinct. It is an acquired artificial emotion. Love of one's native soil, loyalty to regional traditions, do not mean violent hostility to one's neighbours. If today the feeling of national pride is intense, it only shows the prodigious capacity of human nature for self-deception. Self-interest, material greed and lust for domination are the operative ideals. Patriotism has killed piety, and passion logic. Those who are not fortunate in the matter of earthly possessions protest against the unfair apportionment of the earth's surface. The British have a quarter of the land area of the world. France comes next. Even small nations like Holland, Belgium and Portugal have large colonial possessions. Germany wants room to live, expand and dominate. The need for living-room becomes the controlling motive of the policies of the unsatisfied and ambitious powers. If we assume that the most powerful race must be the master of the world, ruthlessness becomes the pursuit of divine

destiny. When an Oxford scholar asked Hitler what his policy was, he answered in one passionate word: "Deutschland," and we cannot deny that he has been inflexibly true to this purpose. He says: "Let us be inhuman! If we rescue Germany we have done the greatest deed in the world. Let us do wrong! If we rescue Germany we have swept away the greatest wrong in the world. Let us be immoral! If our people is rescued we have opened a way for the return of morality."[1] In *Mein Kampf*[2] Hitler says: "Foreign policy is a means to an end, and the sole end to be pursued is the advantage of our own nation." Again: "This is the one consideration that matters. All other considerations, political, religious, humanitarian, must be completely disregarded in favour of this one." The whole of human life is subjected to the single end of national efficiency.[3] A young German pilot whose plane had been brought down by anti-aircraft fire was taken into a French home turned into a hospital. He was mortally wounded. The doctor bent over him and said: "You are a soldier and you can face death bravely. You have only an hour to live. Would you like to dictate a letter for your family?" The boy shook his head. Pointing to women and children grievously wounded, the doctor said: "Now that you are about to face your God, you surely wish to express your sorrow for what you have done, now that you see the results of your work." The dying pilot replied: "No, I only regret that I cannot continue to carry out the orders of my Führer. Heil Hitler!" and he fell back dead. Nazism is a people's movement. The Russian Government may be anti-religious, but not the people. When Russia joined the present war, the crowded Moscow congregations were mentioned with pride, as praying for the success of the Russian arms and impugning Hitler as the most deadly enemy of religion. The struggle is now officially described as "the war for the Holy Soviet fatherland and for the liberation of peoples." It is not one people, but the whole

[1] See *The Deeper Causes of the War*, by Gilbert Murray and others (1940), p. 43.

[2] P. 686.

[3] Cp. Fichte: "No law and no right exist between States except the right of the stronger. A people metaphysically predestined has the moral right to complete its destiny with all the means of power and sagacity."—*Doctrine of the State.*

"The vague and undefined schemes of Teutonic expansion are but the expression of the deeply rooted feeling that Germany has, by the strength and purity of her national purpose, the fervour of her patriotism, the high standard of competency and perspicuous honesty of her administration, the successful pursuit of every branch of public and scientific activity and the elevated character of her philosophy, arts and ethics, established for herself the right to assert the primacy of German national ideals."—Sir Eyre Crowe's "Memorandum" of January 1, 1907.

age, that is nationalistic. With the centralised machinery of the State, with the modern instruments of technical progress and mass propaganda, total mobilisation of the subjects, their bodies, minds and souls is effected. The absolute State and the totalitarian community become identical. The right of the individual to a private life is contested and the natural graces of mankind, love and mercy, disappear. We seem to be in the grip of demoniac forces which degrade mankind to the semblance of the lower animals. The god-man becomes the herd animal. The creed of the great Leviathan compels us to lead lives of effort and emptiness, heartless, vulgar, trivial and coarse in spirit. Our humanness is destroyed by regimentation. It has taken centuries of patient fumbling and heroic effort to learn that life in oneself and others is sacred. Every individual person has his own radiance, his peculiar glamour, if only our eye is sensitive enough to behold it. The desire to be good is an essential part of our make-up. However much it may be overlaid, camouflaged or transformed, it cannot be destroyed. It is there all the time, and he who discerns it will have a gracious response. Yet the present social order of a capitalist society, a militarist tradition and a world broken up into a number of independent sovereign states, kills the spirit in man.

In different degrees, the nations of the world are possessed by this fanatical patriotism, by this blind will for power, by unscrupulous opportunism. The natural tendency in such a world of conflicting states is to do the others down. It is a case of one's country against the rest in a never-ending contest. Generally the conflict is diplomatic and commercial, but frequently it is open and armed. The energy intended for maintaining the organic unity, the health and wholeness of the world, is diverted to the exaltation of a group or a class, a race or a nation. The state becomes a monstrous slave-driver and our inner lives are deadened. The more dead we are in our inner being, the more efficient are we for nationalist ends. We are relieved of all inward conflicts, as our lives are regulated to the minutest details by a machine which is ruthless in execution and relentless towards all opposition. The state becomes an end in itself with the authority to mechanise our spirits and train us like race-horses.[1]

[1] Cp. McTaggart: "A religion that fastens itself on a means has not risen above fetish worship. Compared with the worship of the State, Zoolatry is rational and dignified. A bull or a crocodile may not have great intrinsic value, but it has some, for it is a conscious being. The State has none."



SIR ASUTOSH MOOKERJEE

We need not confound the familiar with the eternal. Our preference for the present order need not be confused with an inescapable law of the universe. The impulse for truth and compassion which is ingrained in human nature requires us to live as free individuals in a friendly world. The problem of living as neighbours on earth, controlling our powers of self-destruction and using the resources of nature for the health and happiness of all, requires the will for peace, the renunciation of many claims by the privileged classes and national states. If we are true patriots, our attachment will not be local, racial or national, but human. It will be a love of liberty for all, of independence, of peace and social happiness. We will fight not for our country but for civilisation, and secure by co-operative organisation the future development of the world resources for the greatest benefit of mankind. For this we need a re-education of the mind, an improvement in faith and imagination. The reason and will of the universe work through the human individual who can understand the forces of the environment, foresee their operation and regulate them. Evolution is no longer a destiny implacable as the stars in their courses. Its instrument is the human mind and will. A new generation requires to be trained in the ideals of the sacredness and supremacy of spiritual life, the sense of the brotherhood of mankind and love of peace.

War and the New Order

Professor Arnold Toynbee in *The Study of History* examines the circumstances of the birth and growth of civilisations and the conditions of their decay. The rise and development of civilisations cannot depend either on the supremacy of the race or the automatic operation of the environment. They are the outcome of adjustments of difficult relationships between men and their surroundings, and the process is conceived by him as being of the nature of "challenge and response." Changing circumstances constitute a challenge to societies, and out of the effort and suffering which response to them entails civilisations are born and grow. Life is a perpetual endeavour of the creature to adapt itself to the environment. When the environment changes and the adaptation is successful we have progress; when it changes too fast or too abruptly for adaptation to keep pace with it, there is extinction. We have no reason to believe that man by acquiring the use of intelligence

or the lordship of the earth has secured exemption from the necessity which is laid on all living creatures. Whereas in the case of earlier civilisations the challenges were of a material and external nature, the problems of the later ones are mainly inward and spiritual. Growth now cannot be measured in terms of material or technical advance but by creative changes in the world of mind and spirit. Regard for spiritual values, love of truth and beauty, righteousness, justice and mercy, sympathy with the oppressed and belief in the brotherhood of man, are the qualities which will save modern civilisation. Those who separate themselves from the rest of the world in the name of religion or race, nation or polity, are not assisting human evolution but retarding it. History is strewn with the wreckage of civilisations that have failed to adapt themselves, that have failed to produce minds of the requisite wisdom and resource. The discerning find at this time of world peril the close not only of an historical but of a spiritual epoch alike for the human race and for every individual in it who is self-aware. Man, as he is, need not be regarded as the crowning glory of evolution. The story of life on earth goes back more than a thousand million years. In each geological period have appeared creatures which might have been represented as the highest types of creation. Yet those forms of life have been superseded by others.[1] The next stage of evolution is not in man's physique but in his psyche, in his mind and spirit, in the emergence of a larger understanding and awareness, in the development of a new integration of character adequate to the new age. When he gains a philosophic consciousness, an intensity of understanding, a profound apprehension of the meaning of the whole, there will result a more adequate social life which will

[1] Professor James Ritchie, in his Presidential address to the section on Zoology at the meeting of the British Association in Dundee in 1939, presented the implications of the evolutionary view in these words: "Looking back over that 1,200 million year vista of the steady climb of life upon the path of evolution it seems presumptuous for us to suppose that man, the latest new comer, is the last word or the final crowning glory amongst many, and that, with his coming, the great steps in evolution have come to an end. Looking forward to the future of life upon earth, it seems even more presumptuous for us to suppose that for the next 1,000 million years life, so surprisingly inventive in the past, should be tied for all time to come to trifling changes like increases of brain power and better social organisation for mankind. The truth is that we, bound by the past, can imagine nothing more, but if the long vista of evolution is any clue to the future, we cannot regard mankind, the crowning glory of the present, to be more than a stage in life's progress and a milestone upon the path of evolution towards a greater future. To think otherwise is to imagine that with the coming of man, so insignificant in time, the advance and inventiveness of evolution, steadily carried on through an unimaginable vista of years in which no trace of slackening can be perceived, have all but come to an end."

influence not only individuals, but peoples and nations. We have to fight for the new order, first in our own souls, then in the world outside.

This war is not a conflict between civilisation and barbarism, for each of the combatants is fighting to defend civilisation as he understands it. It is not an effort to resurrect a past that is dead or save a crumbling civilisation far gone in decay. It is the last act of disintegration which will precede the eventual birth, through a long period of travail, of a world community. Because we are slow to change, the new conception is struggling to come to birth, is forcing its way through violent eruptions. If the old world has to die in violence, in catastrophe, in misery, terror and chaos, if it should fall bringing down with it much that is good, beautiful and true, spilling the blood, wasting the lives and warping the spirits of many, it is because we are unable peacefully to adjust ourselves to the new world, which all the time has been indivisible in essence and now is pressing to become indivisible in fact. If, of our own free choice, we cannot take the step forward, if we do not ourselves shake off the dead things on our backs, a terrible disaster will open our eyes and help us to cast them off and smash up the rigid forms that are paralysing generous impulse and thwarting intelligence.

The appearance of evil is not an accidental phenomenon. The facts of violence, oppression and hatred are indications, not of chaos and caprice, but of a moral order. When the fundamental law of nature, which is coherence, unity, respect for man and brotherhood, is trampled upon, no other result can we expect than confusion, hatred and war. There is a logic of history, and it is possible that the disorders and confusions are necessary to sweep away much that has grown old, much that has outworn its usefulness, that has stood in the way of progress. Even now, when the world seems to be consumed physically with hate, when force, fear, lies and ruthlessness appear to be the realities of human life, the great ideals of truth and love are also functioning underneath, undermining the domination of force and falsehood. If we have not the imagination and courage to work for world peace and unity, it will be effected violently through the demoniac agents of divine justice. In spite of the storm and stress we are passing through, we may look to the future with confidence and have the moral certainty that there is a profound sense to all this confusion and chaos. Even through these convulsions

and upheavals we may grow to a fuller apprehension of spiritual values which will place humanity on a higher plane. War is not entirely a tumult of mad, tormented multitudes, lost to good sense and driven by a frenzy, but is also a fight for the human spirit by individual men, faithful, enduring, waiting wistfully for the renewal of life and the works of peace. Man the destroyer is man the builder too. This *kurukṣetra* may well become a *dharmakṣetra*. The end may be long in coming. It may take many years or decades or even centuries. It may be a hard birth, the birth of the new world, but any permanent breakdown of human values is unthinkable. There is in each of us a hidden knowledge, a spiritual perception of the unity of life, which holds the human heart to a belief in a better order. There have been times when this belief was weakened and the hope dimmed. But these periods of darkness have preceded a dawning which enriches human life more than words can tell. All our loud protests and temporary triumphs cannot prevail against the march of time, against the forward thrust of human hope and will. Many centuries may elapse before the course of moral evolution has purged man of his intolerance, his love of power, his insensate pleasure in beating an enemy to his knees, before he is able to make the necessary sacrifices of comfort and privilege by which alone he can guard society against injustice and social decay; but the progress of the world will break us in the end, for the world is not in the hands of anarchic caprice. The end of our civilisation is not the end of history; it may well be the opening of a new age.

Secularism is the Chief Weakness of our Age

What are the chief causes of the present distress? When we refer to the causes of the war, we may think of the remote, the primary, or the secondary causes. We may find the cause in Hitler's personal psychology, his evil genius, or in Germany's resentment of the war guilt clauses of the Versailles Treaty or of the refusal to return the former German colonies, or the injured pride and romanticism of a great people. We may trace it to the breakdown of the Disarmament Conference of the League of Nations, or the clash of national ambitions in the overcrowded field of colonial expansion. But no one of these can be responsible for a catastrophe of this size. Each of them is an effect, a consequence, not a cause. What has wrecked

the world so full of hope is the dominance of a false philosophy with its misleading assumptions, beliefs and values.[1]

Civilisation is a way of life, a movement of the human spirit. Its essence lies not in any biological unity of race, or in political and economic arrangements, but in the values that create and sustain them. The politico-economic structure is the framework intended to give expression to the passionate loyalty and allegiance of the people to the vision and values of life which they accept. Every civilisation is the expression of a religion, for religion signifies faith in absolute values and a way of life to realise them. If we do not have a conviction that the values a civilisation embodies are absolute, its rules will become dead letters and its institutions will decay. Religious faith gives us the passion to persevere in the way of life and, if it declines, obedience degenerates into habit and habit slowly withers away. For example, the Nazi and the Communist faiths are secular religions. Any divergence in thought or belief from the authorised system is a crime. The States have become Churches with Popes and Inquisitions. We recite the liturgy when we are received into the cult. We scent out heretics and deliver them to the scaffold. We employ the energies and emotions of religion. The secular faiths exhibit a driving power, a psychological dynamism, which seem to be lacking from the activities of those who try to resist them.

The character of a civilisation is derived from its conception of the nature of man and his destiny. Is man to be regarded in biological terms as the most cunning of animals? Is he an economic being controlled by the laws of supply and demand and class conflicts? Is he a political animal, with a raw excessive politicalism occupying the centre of the human mind, displacing all knowledge, religion and wisdom? Or has he a spiritual element requiring him to subordinate the temporal and the expedient to the eternal and the true? Are human beings to be understood in terms of biology, politics or economics, or are we to take into account their family and social life, love of tradition and place, love of religious hopes and consolations whose history goes back far beyond the oldest civilisations? The deeper meaning of the war is to help us to realise the imperfect conception of man's nature and his true good, in which we are all involved in our way of thinking and our way of

1 "Whence come wars and fightings among you?" asks the writer of the *Epistle of James*, and answers, "Even of your lusts that war in your members."

living. If we are not kind to one another, if all our attempts to bring peace on earth have failed, it is because there are obstacles, malicious, selfish and wicked, in the heart and mind of man which our way of life does not check. If we are humiliated by life today, it is not due to malignant fate. Our achievement in perfecting life's material apparatus has produced a mood of self-confidence and pride, which has led us to exploit matter instead of informing and humanising it. Our social life has given us means but denied us ends. A terrible blindness has afflicted the men of our generation, who do not hesitate to gamble in human sorrow, through hard economic laws in times of peace, and aggression and cruelty in times of war. The exclusion of the element of spirit from the human is the primary cause of the supremacy of matter which we find so burdensome and oppressive. The defeat of the human by the material is the central weakness of our civilisation.

The *Bhagavadgītā* points out that when men deem themselves to be gods on earth, when they cut themselves off from their origin, when they are thus deluded by ignorance, they develop a satanic perversity or egotism that proclaims itself absolute both in knowledge and power.[1] Man has made himself autonomous and dispensed with obedience and humility. He wishes to be his own lord, to be 'as gods.'[2] In his attempt to grasp and control life, build up a culture without God, he rebels against God. Self-sufficiency is carried to extremes. Wars are a result of this apostasy, this exaltation of nature unmodified by grace. The dictators have put themselves in the place of God. They wish to abolish belief in God, for they can brook no rivals. Hitler was the unique creation, the prophetic spirit of the civilisation to which we all belong. When we witness the decisive degradation of values we are driven to exclaim with the Duke of Albany in *King Lear*: "'Tis the times' plague, when mad men lead the blind." Because our leaders are not illumined with the light from the great heights, but reflect only the earth-born light of the intellect, they will reap the fate of Lucifer and descend through the pride of intellect to the pit of destruction.

But man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,

---

[1] īśvaroham aham bhogī siddhohaṁ balavān sukhī . . .
. . . ity ajñāna vimohitāh.—XVI. 14-15.

[2] *Genesis* iii. 5.

His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.[1]

He imagines that he is the roof and crown of things, and has blind faith in the physical and the mechanical, the tangible and the visible. Wealth and profit, rather than the satisfaction of human need, are the aims of industry and commerce. The world of truth, beauty and goodness is proclaimed to be a product of an accidental combination of atoms, destined to end as it began in a cloud of hydrogen gas. Rationalism, which is perfectly justified in rejecting the literal truth of ancient dogmas, has ended in a world-wide assumption that the reality of God is unacceptable. Man with his limitless urge to power and the animal will usurps the divine prerogatives, and tries to build a new world on universal suffrage, mass production, rotarian service, and occasional official compliments to a God of which he is not quite certain. Rootless secularism or the worship of man and the State, faintly flavoured by religious sentiment, is the modern faith. The theories which insist that man should live by bread alone are cutting off man's connections with the world of spirit, and integrating him totally in the worldly communities of class and race, state and nation. He is lured away from his cherished dreams and metaphysical broodings and is getting completely secularised. Even those who repudiate materialism as a metaphysical creed and profess to be religious adopt the materialist attitude in life. The real values by which we live, whatever our professions may be, are the same as those of our enemies: the lust for power, the joy of cruelty and the pride of dominance. The world is filled with the clamour of pain which calls across the ages for justice.

Religion cannot be an opiate unless there are unsatisfied longings which are not all on the material plane. Good food, soft cushions and fine raiment are not enough to satisfy us. Unhappiness and discontent spring not only from poverty. Man is a strange creature, fundamentally different from other animals. He has far horizons, invincible hopes, creative energies, spiritual powers. If they are left undeveloped and unsatisfied, he may have all the comforts which wealth can give, but will still feel that life is not worth while. The great humanist writers, Shaw and Wells, Arnold Bennett and Galsworthy, who are regarded as the prophets of the Dawn, expose

[1] Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, II. ii.

the foibles, inconsistencies and weaknesses of modern life, but they ignore the deeper currents and sometimes misrepresent them. At any rate, they give nothing in their place. In the void left by the removal of tradition, morality and religion, others are putting in vague sentiments of race and power. The modern mind is shaped by Rousseau's *Social Contract*, Marx's *Capital*, Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* and Spengler's *The Decline of the West*. The outward chaos and confusion of our life reflect the confusion of our hearts and minds. Constitutions, says Plato, "are but the reflections in the outside world of the values which prevail in men's minds."[1] There must be a change in the ideals we cherish, in the values we adopt, before we can give social expression to them. We help to secure the future only to the extent to which we ourselves are changed. What is missing in our age is the soul; there is nothing wrong with the body. We suffer from sickness of spirit. We must discover our roots in the eternal and regain faith in the transcendent truth which will order life, discipline discordant elements, and bring unity and purpose into it. If not, when the floods come and the winds blow and beat upon our house, it will fall.[2]

Dialectical Materialism

But is not the materialist justified in asking us to take our stand on the sensible fact, on the concrete realities of this world? The only thing of which we can in some sense be certain is this world; the other world of religion is probably a dream of the mind and, even if existent, wholly unknowable. Marxism exerts a powerful attraction on idealist intellectuals in all countries. Many of us who are dissatisfied with conditions in India are drawn to the Soviet conception, which exalts a classless society, expounds a philosophy of industrialism to a population of peasants, and uses its unique technique of mass psychology to glorify the worth of the worker. Soviet Russia, the nearest approach to Paradise on earth, conscious of its mission, the creation of a new type of state in every part of the world, uttered its defiance to the existent order with

[1] Cp. Rousseau: "O man! seek no further for the author of evil, thou art he. There is no evil but the evil you do or the evil you suffer, and both come from yourself."

[2] Cp. Ruskin: "Since first the dominion of men was asserted over the ocean, three thrones of mark, beyond all others, have been set upon its sands: the thrones of Tyre, Venice and England. Of the first of these great powers, only the memory remains; of the second, the ruin; the third, which inherits their greatness, if it forget their example, may be led through prouder eminence to less pitied destruction."

such passionate persistence of aim and diversity of means as to give colour to the prejudice that subversive propaganda is the very purpose of its existence. This challenge has provoked a reaction equally loud and boisterous, so that it is difficult to know the facts. Never was social controversy conducted with louder noise and more blatant dogmatism. Yet even its worst critics cannot deny that Soviet Russia is a tremendous experiment, more important than the American and the French Revolutions. It is an attempt to recast the entire structure, political, economic and social, of the whole community of nearly two hundred millions, occupying a sixth of the earth's land surface, on the lines of a theory of society propounded by certain social thinkers. In the course of two decades the landlord and the capitalist have disappeared, and individual enterprise is limited to small-scale undertakings of peasants and handicraftsmen.

The call of communism to the world has the passion of religion. It challenges existing evils, offers a clear and definite programme of action, and professes to provide a scientific analysis of economic and political situations. In its concern for the poor and the lowly, in its demand for a more equitable distribution of wealth and opportunity, in its insistence on racial equality, it gives us a social message with which all idealists are in agreement. But our sympathy for the social programme does not necessarily commit us to the Marxist philosophy of life, its atheistic conception of ultimate reality, its naturalistic view of man and its disregard of the sacredness of personality. To sympathise with Marxism as an effective instrument for social revolution is different from accepting its metaphysical background.

Marxism has become a faith with its uncritical supporters and uncompromising opponents Its essential claim is that it is scientific. It is not a revealed dogma, but an objective study of facts. Centuries ago science cut itself loose from scholasticism, which quoted the texts of authorities who were regarded as inspired and therefore infallible men. When Marx said "I am not a Marxist," he meant that he was not pledged to the acceptance of a doctrine final, complete and oppressive. "Marxism pretends only to temporary truth," wrote Rosa Luxemburg with deep insight; "dialectic through and through, it contains in itself the seeds of its own destruction." But the Marxists unfortunately adopt the technique of all dogmatic systems to brand those who do not belong to its

faith as traitors. To the Fascist, the Communist is a damnable heretic; to the Communist, the Capitalist is the ally of Satan. We are all angels, and our opponents devils. If you do not profess the true faith, your loyalty and obedience, your courage and honesty, your devotion and high-mindedness are all vices. We are the saved, and you are the lost. To doubt or to question is a crime, to be punished by the tortures of a concentration camp.

We need not look upon Marxism as a faith, but approach it with the modesty of mind and humility of spirit characteristic of the votary of science. The socialist programme of the Marxist is more adequate to the real needs of mankind and to the exigencies of production by modern technical means. The demand for socialism is a moral demand; but to give scientific necessity to it, it is argued that the hypothesis of dialectical materialism is a more satisfactory explanation of the historical process. The chief elements of the Marxian creed are the theory of value which describes the methods by which the workers are exploited by the capitalists, the hypothesis of dialectical materialism, the economic interpretation of history, the class theory of progress, and a defence of revolution as the method by which the workers are to attain to power.

For the proletariat, capitalist profits consist of the surplus value created by the workers and stolen by the bourgeoisie; but the capitalists believe that they are the legitimate rewards of enterprise and organising ability. I am not competent to speak of the Marxist theory of value, which has not stood the test of criticism. Even those who are in great sympathy with the Marxian philosophy hold that "it is out of harmony with the facts and it is far from self-consistent." [1]

Marx accepts from Hegel the dialectical method and looks upon cosmic evolution as the unfolding of matter according to the dialectical pattern. His metaphysics is materialistic and his method dialectical. Marx offers no proof for metaphysical materialism. He speaks of the materialist conception of history or the economic causation of social phenomena, and thinks that they are a consequence of metaphysical materialism; but the two are unrelated.[2]

[1] H. J. Laski, *Karl Marx* (1934), p. 27.

[2] Cp. Bertrand Russell: "The whole of his theory of economic development may perfectly well be true if his metaphysics is false and false if his metaphysics is true, and, but for the influence of Hegel, it would never have occurred to him that a matter so purely empirical could depend upon abstract metaphysics."—*Freedom and Organisation* (1934), p. 220.

In his *Eleven Theses on Feuerbach*, Marx argues that "the chief defect of all previous materialism—including that of Feuerbach—is that the object (Gegenstand), the reality, sensibility, is only apprehended under the form of the object (Objekt) or of contemplation (Anschauung), but not as human sensible activity or practice, not subjectively." Hence it came about that the active side was developed by idealism in opposition to materialism. In other words, the conception of matter was bound up in other types of materialism with the conception of sensation. Matter was regarded as the cause as well as the object of sensation, and sensation was regarded as something passive by which the mind receives impressions from the outer world. There is no such thing as a passive reception of impressions. Matter rouses the activity of the mind, and matter, as we perceive it, is a human product. Even in the most rudimentary sensation the mind is active. We are not only mirroring the environment, but altering it. To know an object is not to receive an impression of it, but to be able to act on it successfully. The test of all truth is practical. Since we change the object when we act upon it, there is nothing static about truth. It is continually changing and developing. Marx adopts what is now known as the pragmatic character of truth. He looks upon knowledge as an activity exercised on things. It is work interpreted as control and transformation of material forces. But knowledge is valuable in itself. Man wishes to know and not merely to dominate matter. There is a finality about the end of knowledge. There is knowledge of an assured and complete type, where the deepest aspirations of our cognitive side are fulfilled.

Marx calls his materialism dialectical since it contains an essential principle of progressive change. It is called materialist, not because it denies the existence of mind except as a derivative quality of matter or asserts the supremacy of matter over mind, but because it urges that ideas influence history by acting on things, by changing their shape and power. The material things which Marx declares to be the main determinants of social change are not the raw material of nature but human products which bear the impress of mental activity. They are not merely natural objects, but objects informed with the power of the human mind. They are not merely coal, water or electricity, but our knowledge of the ways in which these natural forces can be used to serve human ends. When it is said that the development of productive forces determines

the course of history, we should know that the productive forces include not merely forces of nature, like the fertility of the soil, the properties of metals, solar heat, steam power and electricity, but also the power of the human mind. Marx is obliged to exclude the intelligence of man from the productive forces, since it is brought under the ideological superstructure, which is an effect, a secondary phenomenon. And yet the productive forces have been there for centuries; they became available for economic production only when the intelligence of man discovered them and adapted them for the purpose of production. Even now there may be very many undiscovered forces of nature, waiting to be known and used for unsuspected purposes. The discovery and use of productive forces, from the making of tools, the taming of animals and the beginning of agriculture to the use of steam and electricity, are all acts of the human mind, imagination and purpose. The productive forces do not develop of themselves. Though Marx now and then looks upon the material as the productive forces and the mental as only a reflection of the superstructure of the material, as a shadow cast by the economic movements, his main intention is to regard them both as entering into the nature of the productive forces. The making of tools, for example, is a part of the intellectual life of mankind.

Marx calls his theory 'materialist' to contrast it with Hegelian idealism, for which the world of events is a shadow of the world of pure Idea. He asserts against Hegel that mind and nature are positive entities, not unsubstantial reflections of the Idea. Besides, for Hegel change is an illusion of appearance, whereas for Marx it is the very stuff of reality. The things we see, feel and experience are real and they are perpetually changing, and these changes are intrinsic to them and not imposed on them by the Absolute. Marx believes in the reality of empirical minds and things, which are engulfed in the Absolute in Hegel. He repudiates the crude materialist view in his third gloss on Feuerbach. "The materialist doctrine that men are the products of circumstances and education, and that changed men are therefore the products of other circumstances and a changed education, forgets that circumstances are changed by men, and that the educator must himself be educated." Social change is effected for Marx by the interaction of nature, society and human intelligence.

Matter, according to Marx, is the stuff of cosmic reality. But

let us not be misled by the name. The ultimate principle of reality is not matter, solid, stubborn, unconscious. It is the very essence of spirit, self-active motion. To interpret matter as autodynamic, self-moving and spontaneous is to read into matter what is non-material, the living and the spiritual. Matter, for the dialectical materialist, is not the opposite of mind. It has not merely the promise and potency of mind but its character. It is part of its being that it moves. Dialectical development is its essential and necessary expression. If there is a pattern inherent in reality, an impulse in matter to produce life and mind, the primary principle is not mere matter as it is generally understood.

Marx is interested not so much in giving us a theory of the cosmos as in providing us with a clue to the understanding of the historical process. The analysis of the atom or the birth of a planet does not engage his attention. He deals with historical events; and history is different from natural processes in that it is the activity of man in pursuit of ends. In nature we deal with the interaction of unconscious blind forces. Natural events are not consciously willed ends. In human behaviour we desire ideas, we will ends, and yet the effects are not always what we intend. The conflicting forces which drive men in daily life result in situations which are different from what we will Historical effects are not the results of chance. We cannot say that anything could have happened at any time. We may not know all the antecedent circumstances, but we hold that effects have causes and ideals of the human mind are among them. The forces which determine the processes of history are not purely geographical or biological. Climate, topography, soil and race are among the factors which *condition* historic changes, but they do not *determine* them. Human society changes according to other principles.

If we say that the real is the rational, all that we are required to do is to maintain what is, and our attitude will be one of conservatism. If, on the other hand, the rational is the real, it will be our endeavour to incorporate rationality in the existing order, and our attitude will be one of reform or revolution. The latter view is adopted by Marx. It assumes the need to change the world, and the reality of human freedom. If our actions are determined by something other than ourselves, they are not our actions.

For Hegel, dialectic is a part of logic. The evolution of the idea is accomplished by a ceaseless movement of oppositions. Every

idea embodies an aspect of the truth and takes us into its opposite, which is also a partial truth. Out of the conflict between the two, a new and higher idea arises, producing a new opposite and conflict. This process of thesis, antithesis and synthesis goes on until the goal which embodies the whole truth and nothing but the truth is reached. We start with the idea of *being*; the idea of *not-being* follows naturally. These two ideas opposing each other, a new and higher thought in which the opposition is overcome arises. The opposition of being and non-being is overcome in the idea of becoming. The new thought leads to a new contradiction which in turn takes us to a higher thought reconciling both, and the process goes on until we reach the Absolute Idea. This is the 'self-development of the idea' according to Hegel. In a strictly logical way, Hegel develops, by the application of this method, the whole of philosophy, history and natural science as well. For Hegel, history is a continuous self-realisation or materialisation of mind, and so it must necessarily develop and accomplish itself by the dialectical method.

Marx applies the dialectical method not to the sphere of ideas and their self-development, but to the material development of society. He examines historical evolution with its changes and contradictory tendencies, and affirms that the process of historical development is indeed a progression through a series of contradictions. Any existing state leads to its opposite, and these contradictions lead in turn to a higher state of society in which the contradictions are overcome.

Both Hegel and Marx believe the historical evolution to be dialectical. The difference is, that while Hegel believes that an absolute mind is materialising itself in history, the world of events being but its outward appearance, Marx contends that the historical events are primary and our ideas of them secondary. In the preface to the second edition of *Capital*, Marx emphasises the difference between materialist dialectic and idealist dialectic. "My own dialectical method," says Marx, "is not only fundamentally different from the Hegelian dialectical method, but is its direct opposite. For Hegel, the thought process (which he actually transforms into an independent subject, giving to it the name of Idea) is the demiurge (creator) of the real; and for him the real is only the outward manifestation of the Idea. In my view, on the other hand, the idea is nothing other than the material when it has been transposed and translated inside the human brain. Although in Hegel's

hands dialectic underwent a mystification, this does not obviate the fact that he was the first to expound the general forms of its movement in a comprehensive and fully conscious way. In Hegel's writings dialectic stands on its head. You must turn it right way up again if you want to discover the rational kernel that is hidden away within the trappings of mystification."[1] Hegel gives us a development of ideas in terms of a logical and timeless order of necessity, and dissolves the succession of temporal structure into appearance. All the laws of dialectic set forth by Hegel are accepted by Marx. The substitution of matter for idea replaces philosophical idealism by revolutionary science. The development of history is logical for both Marx and Hegel; and it is plausibly accounted for in Hegel, for whom mind is the ultimate reality. For Marx matter is the ultimate reality, and it is more difficult for a materialist to think that the world develops according to a logical formula.

The Marxists assume that the external world is moving with an inevitable necessity in exactly the same way in which they wish it to go. The world, according to them, is working towards the building of a communist society. Such a society is an historic necessity. It seems to be the very gift of the material universe. "The working classes," writes Marx, "have no ideal to realise: they have only to set free the elements of the new society." The laws of the capitalist system "work with iron necessity toward inevitable results." Engels writes: "With the same certainty with which from a given mathematical proposition a new one is deduced, with that same certainty can we deduce the social revolution from the existing social conditions and the principles of political economy." Such a view, that facts and ideals, existence and value, are adapted to each other, is, to say the least, not a scientific truth. It is a speculative hypothesis, a matter of faith. Why should we assume that the forces of the world back our desires? Marx is fond of repeating Feuerbach's saying that "the metaphysician is a priest in disguise." Marx himself is philosophising when he declares that his ideal of human society is worked into the very texture of the world. In this we have a sign of the religious attitude.

Though Marx holds that his views are founded on reality and not on speculation, it is clear that he gives us an interpretation to

[1] "Hegel's dialectic is the fundamental principle of all dialectic only after its mystical form has been sloughed off. And that is precisely what distinguishes my method," wrote Marx to Kugelmann.

suit his theory. When he says that society moves from feudalism to capitalism, and from capitalism to socialism, he is using words which cover immense multitudes of facts. An historical period may be represented by a proper selection of events, to be indicative of this or that tendency. The nineteenth century may be looked upon as the period of middle-class domination, or the age of industrialism or imperialism, or nationalism or liberalism, according to the currents we wish to emphasise or personally consider to be the most important. We may interpret the twentieth century as the opposite of it by a suitable selection of events, or as a continuation of it by a shift of emphasis to other facts. All that may be highly interesting, but is not objectively true. History is not a recapitulation of facts, but a way of looking at them. It involves interpretation and selection. Yet there must be a proportion, to use Lord Acton's words, between historic thought and historic fact. Marxists identify ancient times with slave economy, the Middle Ages with "serf economy," the modern age with capitalistic economy, and the future with the "socialisation of the means of production"; and this neat division may not apply to all countries. Hegel, who adopts a similar view of history, indulges in capricious characterisations. In one statement, Greece is identified with the "liberty of the individual," Rome with the State, and the Roman world "with the union of the individual and the universal." In another, the Orient is identified with the "infinite," Graeco-Roman antiquity with the "finite," and the Christian era with the "synthesis of the finite and the infinite." But history does not proceed according to any strict law. Historical evolution does not invariably proceed through a series of contradictions. The development proceeds at different paces and in varying fashions, now in a transition from one state to its opposite, now in an unbroken line. To say, as Marx does: "no progress without contradiction, that is the law which civilisation has obeyed up to this day," is to make an arbitrary statement. Marx contends that the transition from feudalism to socialism is through middle-class domination and capitalism; yet Russia was in the feudal, and not the capitalist, state of society when socialism was established.

Marx has faith in the inevitability of progress. The movement of society is a forward one. Each successive stage represents development, is nearer the rational ideal than its predecessors, the rational ideal being the free community in which there will be neither



KAMALA DEVI

master nor slave, neither rich nor poor, in which the world's goods, produced in accordance with the social demand unhampered by the caprice of individuals, are distributed rationally. The forces of history will issue in such a development, and we cannot help or hinder it. But history is full of examples of decay and retrogression, and cannot be regarded as a continuous development through conflict. We cannot be sure that human progress is inevitable. That would be a relapse into fatalism. It is not possible, either in the life of the individual or in that of society, to determine the precise moment at which the new period with its asserted contradiction actually begins. History is an uninterrupted becoming, a ceaseless stream of which no one knows either the beginning or the end. Marxist theory is not the result of an inductive survey, but is of a deductive character. Marx adapts Hegelian logic to his own materialist views.

The liberal view that we must give up class war, renounce the use of force, appeal to the sense of human solidarity and justice, is repudiated by Marx. The premise that the capitalist classes are amenable to rational persuasion, he holds, is wrong. Our purposes are made what they are by the economic context in which we are placed. We must fight the capitalists, not because we choose but because we must.

The difficulties of Hegelian dialectic are present in the Marxist version. For Hegel, contradiction is the primary principle, which is at the basis of all advance. In developing his theory, Hegel makes a confusion of opposites and distincts. Croce has elaborated this point in his book on *What is Living and What is Dead of the Philosophy of Hegel.*[1] Light and darkness negate each other. They are incompatible. The presence of the one implies the absence of the other. The opposites cancel each other. But the distincts, like truth and beauty, philosophy and art, do not exclude each other. The idea of limit is different from that of negation. Negation is not the only aspect of nature. If economic forces condition historic evolution, it does not follow that other forces do not. The forces of economic necessity and religious idealism may interact and mould the future of history.

Marx suggests that the development through successive contradictions will go on until all mankind has become communistic. With the establishment of world communism, dialectical evolution

[1] E.T. (1915).

will come to an end. Hegel concluded his dialectical account of history with the establishment of the Prussian State, which represented to him the perfect embodiment of the Absolute Idea. Marx believes that it cannot be the end. "It is only in the order of things in which there will no longer be classes or class anatgonism that *social evolution* will cease to be political revolution." Marx criticises Hegel for assuming that with the arrival of the Prussian State all conflicts and struggles will disappear. Is it because he believes that the end of history is reached, not by Hegel's Prussian State, but by his own communist society? If the evolution of human society is a perpetual play of materialist forces in which, through a series of conflicts and class wars, capitalism is ended and a classless and equalitarian state is established, why should this new society be exempt from the law of dialectical progress determined by materialist forces? If it is not exempt, will a new antithesis develop in opposition to it? Or will the laws inherent in the world of matter cease to operate, having achieved their end, and produce new laws by an unknown process of emergent evolution? If dialectic is essentially revolutionary, why should it stop when the classless state is established? If there is still scope for evolution after the class conflicts are ended, then there must be causes of progress other than class conflicts. Marx admits that there is scope for "social evolution" even after the communist society is established. What are the conflicts in social life which will provide it with driving force? The principle of dialectic still operates in a communist society, though we cannot describe in detail the exact form of its operation; we may assume that the advance will be evolutionary and co-operative, rather than revolutionary and antisocial. The obstacles to self-development imposed by economic problems will be removed, and creative personalities will find ample scope for growth. Love and friendship, courage and adventure will be more potent than fear and hatred, struggle for power and self-interest. There will be suffering and unhappiness, but these will be on a higher level. The present economic order is unjust not because it makes men unhappy but because it makes them *inhuman.* Happiness is not the end of man, but dignity.[1] The truth in the doctrine of the dialectical movement of history is that from the

[1] Nietzsche's savage thrust at Bentham: "Man does not desire happiness, only the Englishman does," would have received Marx's approval. Marx remarks in *Capital* that "with the driest naïveté, Bentham takes the modern shopkeeper, especially the English shopkeeper, as the normal man."

conflict of contradictory opinions and interests, and from their discussion, new knowledge in the theoretical sphere and new institutions in the practical world arise; for all nature seeks a harmony and cannot rest content with an unsolved discord.

The economic interpretation of history states that economic phenomena, especially economic production, are fundamental and all that we call culture, religion, politics, social and intellectual life are secondary products, determined by the mode of production, and are its immediate consequence. Conditions of production constitute the economic structure of society, which is the material basis of the social, political and intellectual life. When the mode of production changes by the discovery of a new force or a new technical invention, the conditions of production change. They create an ideological superstructure, that is, conditions of property, power and opinions. These cause a renewal of the conditions of production and so, by action and interaction, the progress of society is achieved. When the material forces of production come into conflict with the existing conditions of production, the system of property under which they work, difficulties arise. This theory appeals by its very simplicity, and its plausibility is increased by the fact that economic phenomena are of great importance in life and history. By a careful selection of certain groups of facts and omission of others, the theory may be presented as logical and conclusive. The emphasis on the importance of economic conditions is correct; the suggestion that they are exclusively determinant of history is incorrect.

Aristotle taught us long ago that we must live before we can live well. We must eat, shelter and clothe ourselves before we can draw, paint or speculate. The distinction between life and good life is taken up by Marx and developed into a theory. Engels gives an account of how the distinction arose. "Marx discovered the simple fact (heretofore hidden beneath ideological overgrowths) that human beings must have food, drink, clothing and shelter first of all, before they can interest themselves in politics, science, art, religion and the like. This implies that the production of the immediately requisite material means of subsistence and therewith the existing phase of development of a nation or epoch constitute the foundation upon which the state institutions, the legal outlooks, the artistic and even the religious ideas are built up. It implies that these latter must be explained out of the former, whereas

the former have usually been explained as issuing from the latter." The productive forces are a primary factor conditioning all others. But it does not follow that all things can be explained by the primary factors. The indispensable condition is not the effective cause. Tradition, propaganda and ideals are among the factors that occasion changes. Marx distinguishes between the forces of production and the modes of production. Before forces become modes the human mind must intervene. All novelties occur first as ideas in the human mind. Conditions and causes are so interwoven in a seamless pattern that it is difficult to disentangle the different threads. If economic forces by themselves determine cultural modes, men become purposeless and history is an illusion. If history is not a mechanical stream of events, men choose the ends and determine the means for achieving them.

It is inaccurate to identify the economic structure of society with society itself. While the economic structure is important, it is not the sole reality of society. Though Engels admits that "the different moments of the superstructure also exercise their influence on the progress of historic struggles," he takes away the point of this admission by declaring that "these movements all influence one another but in the long run the economic movement necessarily has the upper hand over the infinite multitude of chances." Simply because the other factors are imponderable, we cannot treat them as non-existent. The view that conditions of production create a certain ideology, which in time creates new conditions of production, is a mere conjecture. Conditions of production and ideological superstructure do not work by shifts. They exist and work simultaneously. Again, we cannot say that the ideological superstructure is the result of modes of production. For example, our religious ideas are not the results of economic conditions. Primitive man feels that he is not all powerful, that events occur against his will and often independently of it. The world in which he lives is not made by him. Eclipses and earthquakes occur without his consent. He posits spirits and gods and traces unexplained events and occurrences to them. Man's intense desire to live, and not any mode of production, leads him to believe in a future life. Engels admits that religion is not determined by the mode of production. He says: "Religion is nothing, but the fantastic reflection in men's minds of those external forces which control their daily life, a reflection in which terrestrial forces assume the form of supernatural forces. In the

beginning of history, it was the forces of nature that were at first so reflected, and in the course of further evolution they underwent the most manifold and varied personifications amongst the various peoples."[1] What is true of religion is true of other cultural institutions. It is only in a very restricted sense that we can say that the economic system of a society is the real basis of all legal, political and intellectual phenomena. These phenomena cannot exist independently of it. There can be no plant without soil. But plants grow not only by the soil, though they grow out of it. The seed must be sown and other conditions should be provided. Even so the ideological superstructure requires the economic system but is not explained by it. There can be no good life without life; but mere life does not account for the values we cherish.

Marx admits that there is order in history; but it is not teleological. Nor is it the product of the automatic operation of impersonal forces, absolute spirit, mechanical nature or economic production. History is made by men, not this or that individual person but men in groups or classes. The activities of classes are not necessarily what can be expected from the motives of the individuals who form the classes. Great individuals are representatives of classes which give them opportunities for achieving their greatness. Human effort is the method by which what is determined comes to pass. Marx urges that historical changes are brought about by class conflicts. While the productive forces are said to be the basic element in history, and the conditions of production are looked upon as a form of development of these forces and all the rest as an ideological superstructure, class war is the method or form in which the historical evolution of man is accomplished. The forces of production are in constant evolution as our knowledge and command over them increase, and these bring about changes in the political structure of society. The political form, however, embodies the authority of particular classes who do not generally keep step with the changes in the resources of production. The classes in power wish to cling to their privileges and do not yield to changes without a struggle. What oppresses men is not the productive mechanism, but the social relations in which it works. Changing economic needs demand changes in the political system; and when the dominant classes resist political changes, struggles ensue. When the forces making for change

[1] *Anti-Dühring*, pp. 353-4.

become powerful the class struggle enters on a revolutionary phase; the old political system is shattered by violence, and a new system embodying a different set of values and interests emerges. In the *Communist Manifesto*, the theory of class war is thus set forth: "The history of all societies that existed up to our time is the history of class struggles; freemen and slaves, patricians and plebeians and barons and serfs, masters and companions of a guild, in short, oppressors and oppressed lived in constant opposition to one another, and in uninterrupted warfare against one another, a war which at certain times was latent and at other times became open strife, and which every time ended either in a revolutionary transformation of the whole society or in the extinction of both classes." We have had class struggles in nearly all countries and times, and today they play a greater part than ever before. History is not, however, a mere record of class struggles. Wars between nations have been more frequent and violent than domestic struggles, and in the earlier history of mankind tribes and towns fought with one another. The feeling of nationality is stronger than class consciousness in the present war. All through history the rulers and the ruled, the rich and the poor, fought side by side against the enemies of the country. We hate foreign workers more than we do our own capitalist employers. There are wars of religion, such as the wars for and against the Reformation which went on in Europe for two centuries. Men of all classes, poor and rich, princes and peasants, nobles and workmen, were on both sides and fought with fanatic zeal. Marxists, with a few exceptions, are fighting today for the capitalistic states to which they happen to belong. We cannot look upon the present war as a perverted form of class feeling. The conflicts between the Hindu and the Muslim in India, or between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland, are not manifestations of class struggles. There are class struggles and civil wars, but there are wars of religions and nations also. The latter have been more decisive for human evolution.

Again, it is not historically correct to argue that war is the inevitable consequence of capitalism. It may be true that capitalist empires need new markets, and for winning them wars are waged; but capitalism has existed only for a few centuries, while wars have been fought for thousands of years. There is no certainty that the world will settle down to peace if a different kind of social system is introduced in all countries. Communist Russia engages in war

to defend itself against foreign aggression, and to destroy capitalism in other states. Even if communism were established in all countries of the world, differences would arise in regard to the true nature of communism and the way to operate it. It is inconceivable that there will ever come a time in which there will be no contradictory opinions or interests, no differences among men. The mainsprings of human behaviour are varied. Love of soil, lust for power, herd instinct, are quite as important as acquisitiveness and ambition. So long as the tendency to fight for our opinions, passions and desires against those who oppose them is unchecked, wars will continue whatever be the social system. If human nature does not change, acute differences will continue to be settled by the weapons of war, and our hopes that a time will come when conflicts will be decided not by the edge of the sword but by the power of the mind, will be deferred. To represent history as a series of internal struggles, to ignore the forces of race, religion and patriotism, is to over-simplify the complex problem of human evolution. Engels uttered some cautious words: "Marx and he had in their polemics sometimes exaggerated their assertions. They never imagined they were putting forth a formula by which all historical events could be explained; if this were possible, the comprehension of historical periods would be as easy as the solution of a simple equation."

The truth pointed out by Marx is that the enormous quantity of goods produced by modern technique would, if only the distribution were different, suffice to satisfy the needs of all; and this will remove the discontent of those who are now suffering from hunger. Hungry people are desperate as the satisfied can never be, and the *Communist Manifesto* appeals to them. It ends with the words: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and their aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite." In his protest against the theory of *laissez-faire* individualism in the economic sphere Marx is justified. Political liberty is of little value in the face of growing economic inequality. The assumption of an automatic harmony of interests in the economic sphere, the belief that, if each individual intelligently pursued his own interests, the maximum benefit would automatically accrue to society, is not tenable. An individual

pursuing his own interest does not, in that very process, perform his duty to society. The masses are devoted not so much to individual freedom as to jobs, food and reasonable security.

The materialist hypothesis, even in the revised version of dialectical materialism, is no more satisfactory than other species of materialism. The view that mind is simply a function of matter, and its ideas and evolution determined by the natural conditions of the physical organism, the social and economic structure of each generation and the physical process of which it is a function, is one-sided and misleading. That history is an organic or creative process is a proposition which Marx learnt not only from Hegel but from his Jewish ancestors. This meaningful pattern, this creative movement, is not explicable in terms of the development of the productive forces. Development is brought about by the creative impulse in man. What is the source of this creative impulse? Why is man not content with merely an animal existence? Granting that the world is proceeding by a dialectical necessity towards a consummation in time, a new order of existence, what is the source of its life and movement? To say that history is a meaningful process is to deny the adequacy of the materialist view. To take it as an ultimate fact is to leave it as a mystery. And mystery is the breeding-ground of religion. Again, religion proposes to transform human nature, and Marx believes that its result is achieved by social change. "By acting on the external world and changing it," says Marx, "man changes his own nature."[1] By controlling the conditions of social life, man can make over his nature in accordance with his free will. He writes: "M. Proudhon does not know that the whole of history is nothing but the progressive transformation of human nature"; and this is exactly what religion aims at.

The historic controversy between science and religion is out of date, for the science which challenged religion is as dead as the religion which it challenged. The problem today relates not to the incredible dogmas of religion, but to the place of the spiritual in a universe which cannot be explained altogether by science. The kingdom of spirit is, always has been and always will be, within each of us. It is not to be won either by observation or by external changes.

Those Indians who are attracted by the Marxist social programme must reconcile it with the fundamental motives of Indian life.

[1] *Capital*, I. 198.

There is a difference between the construction of a Utopia and that of an historical ideal. An abstract conception isolated from concrete existence at any given period is a Utopia, a fictitious model of a perfect social order. On the other hand, an historical ideal reckons with the concrete situation, and frames on its basis not an absolute, but a relative, perfection. Historical growth is determined in regard to certain fundamental characteristics by the concrete setting, though it is indeterminate in regard to its future development. The future is not freed in advance, and the human spirit which is endowed with liberty can triumph over necessity, outward and inward, and determine the movement of history. The ideal social order for India will have to take into account the spiritual direction of our life from which the central doctrine of the communists, the brotherhood of man, derives. To the young who are sure that the days of religion are over, we may say that they are the least qualified, and therefore the most prone to form confident opinions on subjects of vital importance. Plato's advice is not altogether impertinent.[1]

Hitler's attack on Russia provoked an outburst of patriotic fervour on the part of all the religious bodies, including alike the Churches and the "Sectaries." They can no more be suspected of association with "Counter-revolutionary" conspiracy. The sincere and enthusiastic rally of the religious bodies in support of the Government of the U.S.S.R. has resulted in Stalin's official reception of the leaders of the orthodox Church, and the recognition of its freedom to convene its national assembly to elect a Patriarch and constitute a Holy Synod.[2] The Soviet Government recognises religious freedom, and does not interfere in a matter which properly

1 " My lad, you are still young and time as it advances will lead you to a complete reversal of many of your present convictions ; you should wait for the future, then, before you undertake to judge of the supreme issues ; and the greatest of these—though you now count it so trivial—is that of thinking rightly about the gods and so living well or the reverse. . . . If you will be ruled by me, you will wait for the fulness of clear and confident judgment on these matters to come to you, and inquire whether truth lies in one direction or another seeking for guidance in all quarters . . . meanwhile beware of all impiety towards gods."—*Laws*, 888 (A. E. Taylor's E.T.).

2 An official statement regarding Marshal Stalin's reception of the three metropolitans of Moscow, Leningrad and the Ukraine on 4th September 1943 includes the following important paragraph :

" In the course of the interview the Metropolitan Sergius informed the Chairman that the authoritative circles of the Orthodox Church had formed the intention of convening in the near future a conclave of bishops for the election of a Patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia, and for the establishment of a Holy Synod. The Head of the Government, Comrade J. V. Stalin, then stated that on the part of the Government there would be no objection to this proposal."

belongs to the Church. The previous fierce opposition to the Church was mainly due to its unintelligent anti-democratic outlook and its senile subservience to the Romanoff dynasty. Excesses occurred into which we need not now enter. Even now it may be that political considerations have led to the Russian Government's change of policy. Whatever may be the motives, this historic decision recognises the place of religion in the life of the people.

The Need for Spiritual Revival

To gain the ends which Marx and his adherents have in view, to achieve the extinction of unhappy hates, we need a spiritual revival. The new world order must have a deep spiritual impulse to give it unity and drive. It alone can give a rational basis to the social programme. We must, as the late Henri Bergson said, "look to that God common to all mankind, the mere vision of whom, could all men but attain it, would mean the immediate abolition of war." How can we obtain the vision of God to which Bergson refers? How can we be delivered from sin and futility and helped to attain that insight into the Real which is one for all? Religion is based on the discovery of the essential worth and dignity of the individual and his relation to a higher world of reality. When the human being perceives that he belongs to an order of reality higher than brute nature, he cannot be satisfied by worldly success or the triumphs of materialistic science. That he is capable of martyrdom for ideals shows that he lives in and for a world of eternal realities. Worship is man's outreach to the divine. Religion is the discipline which touches the conscience and helps us to struggle with evil and sordidness, saves us from greed, lust and hatred, releases moral power, and imparts courage in the enterprise of saving the world. As a discipline of the mind, it contains the key and the essential means of coping with evil which threatens the existence of the civilised world. It implies the submitting of our thinking and conduct to the truths of spirit.

Religion in the past has been mixed up with magic and witchcraft, quackery and superstition. The dogmas which once were paths to divine life, but are now hindrances, should not be allowed to interpose a barrier between man and God and spoil the essential simplicity of spiritual life. Religion, as its very name connotes, should be the binding force which deepens the solidarity of human

society in spite of the obvious shortcomings of historical forms. In its essence, religion is a summons to spiritual adventure. It is not theology, but practice and discipline. It is the only remedy for the pride of spirit which has divorced itself from the eternal. When the human spirit defies its sources and conditions, and claims an absolute self-sufficiency, it becomes mad and suicidal. To restore the lost relationship between the individual and the eternal is the purpose of religion.

The essence of religion is not in the dogmas and creeds, in the rites and ceremonies which repel many of us, but in the deepest wisdom of the ages, the *philosophia perennis*, sanātana dharma, which is the only guide through the bewildering chaos of modern thought. The different religions represent not truth, but views or apprehensions of truth; what men have believed. They are varied historical expressions of the one truth, which is universal and timeless in its validity. St. Augustine observes: "That which is called the Christian religion existed among the ancients and never did not exist, from the beginning of the human race until Christ came in the flesh, at which time the true religion which already existed began to be called Christianity." [1]

In this period of creative travail, India is privileged, even by the depths of its suffering, to be a light to the world, the bearer of a message of universal import. India is not a racial identity, for a racialist destiny is spurious. Pure racial types are an ideal figment of anthropology. In real life it is not easy to find individuals who combine all the characters of the same type. Men everywhere exhibit features belonging to different racial types, and even members of the same family hardly ever possess the same racial characters. Indian culture is not racially exclusive, but has affected men of all races. It is international in feeling and intention. As the typical religion of India, Hinduism represents this spirit, the spirit that has such extraordinary vitality as to survive political and social changes. From the beginning of recorded history, Hinduism has borne witness to the sacred flame of spirit which must remain for ever, even while dynasties crash and empires tumble into ruins. It alone can give our civilisation a soul, and men and women a principle to live by.

There is the elemental urge in man not only to live but to live nobly. When our passion for noble living receives cosmic backing, we have the peculiar ardour of religion. There is no one who does

[1] *Lib. de vera religione*, Ch. 10.

not raise at some moment or other those fundamental questions: What am I? What is my origin? What is my destiny?[1] Besides, we have the feeling of amazement at the mystery of the universe, faith in its orderliness, and endless quest for answers to the perennial riddles, an eager longing to discover the truth of things, the truth which is universal and absolute in the sense that it is valid for all men, in all places, at all times. The experience of the mysterious is the fundamental quality underlying all religion. Goethe says: "man's highest happiness as a thinker is to have fathomed what can be fathomed, and to bow in reverence before the unfathomable." There are certain facts and values of which no explanation can be given. We do not know why the world exists, what its relation is to the realm of values, which is not less real than the world of space and time. If we can discern and acknowledge these limits to human reason, it is because there is in us the spirit which is superior to discursive reason, which uses this reason as its instrument. The two cannot be separated; for spirit is really the whole personality acting under the guidance of its higher part; and when the spirit functions, we have the vision of God. Though the intellectual tendency is natural (naisargika) to the human mind, the integral is its manifest destiny. Occasionally perhaps each of us has had a few moments of impersonal joy, when we seem to tread not on solid earth but on uplifting air, when our whole being is transfused with a presence that is unutterable, yet apprehensible, when we are bathed in an unearthly atmosphere, when we touch the very limits of beatitude, where seeking interests and yearnings unfulfilled yield to attainment and serenity. Such moments of insight and moods of joy are a heightening and expansion, a deepening and enrichment of oneself, and yet of identity with the universe. In these experiences of shattering profundity, of intense exhilaration, when we are raised on wings into contact with reality, when we are filled with light and environed by the presence of spirit, we acquire a wonderful clarity of mind and feel ourselves to be parts of a friendly universe. Men of unimpeachable character and veracity have spoken in solemn words

[1] Consider the jingle:

"O, whither go all the nights and days?
And where can tomorrow be?
Is anyone there, when I'm not there?
And why am I always me?"

Walter de la Mare, *Pleasures and Speculations* (1940).

These are riddles which occur even to a child, though no philosopher has ever yet answered them to the satisfaction of all.

of the way in which their whole being is transformed. Spirit is their life, light and joy. Their whole nature is questing activity, apprehensiveness. While they live in the quietude of their own spirit, their bodies are intense and urgent with vitality.

Religion is rooted in a sense of the wonderfulness and eternal mystery of life itself, its grace and power, a feeling of rapture when we reach the satisfying object; and without these a man is as good as dead. "Whoever, O Gārgī, without knowing this Imperishable departs from this world, he is poor or to be pitied; on the other hand, whoever, having known the Imperishable, departs from this world is a Brāhmin."[1] Again: "If we know him here, then is fruition of life; if we do not know him here, that is the greatest calamity."[2] Human life has no meaning if it is not inspired by an unquenchable yearning for contact with the eternal. Plotinus says: "For this, the Beauty supreme, the absolute and the primal, fashions its lovers to Beauty and makes them also worthy of love. And for this the sternest and the uttermost combat is set before the souls; all our labour is for this, lest we be left without part in this noblest vision, which to attain is to be blessed in the blissful sight; which to fail of is to fail utterly. "For not he that has failed of the joy that is in colour or in visible forms, not he that has failed of power or of honours or of kingdoms has failed; but only he that has failed of only This; for whose winning he should renounce kingdoms."

Life remains unfulfilled until there is a vision of the Supreme. The soul has an eye as surely as the body has, by which it knows the sovereign truth, and learns to love the sovereign perfection which is God. "The sages see constantly that highest dwelling place of God even as the eye sees the sky."[3] Such experiences have occurred in all branches of the human family,[4] though they may be explained differently in different ages and peoples. Moses exclaims: "The eternal God is my refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."[5] The Psalmist deals with a similar experience of being brought into the eternal dwelling, and of a companionship with One who was and is before the mountains were brought to

[1] yo vā etad akṣaraṁ gārgi aviditvā' smāllokāt preti sa kṛpaṇaḥ;
athaḥ etad akṣaraṁ gārgī viditvā' smāllokāt preti sa brāhmaṇaḥ.

[2] mahatīvinaṣṭih.

[3] sadā paśyanti sūrayah tad viṣṇoh paramaṁ padaṁ divīvacakṣur ātatam.—*Ṛg Veda*.

[4] ṛṣi ārya mlecchānāṁ samānaṁ lakṣaṇam.

[5] *Deuteronomy* xxxiii. 27.

birth or the world was framed.[1] The world of spirit is an essential feature of Plato's philosophy. It is for him the ground and home of truth, beauty and goodness. The human mind is not limited to the world of matter, and it can be raised into intimate correspondence with the transcendental and supersensuous realm of reality. St. Paul writes: "though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. . . . While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." [2] "Many times it has happened," says Plotinus (A.D. 207-270), "that (I have been) lifted out of the body into myself, becoming external to all other things and self-centred, beholding a marvellous beauty; more than ever assured of community with the loftiest order: acquiring identity with the divine." [3] "Once *there*, the soul will barter this experience for nothing the universe holds, not though one would make over to her the heavens entire; than this there is nothing higher, nothing more good. Above this there is no passing." [4] Augustine began his *Confessions* with the memorable words, "Thou, O Lord, hast made us for thyself, and our heart is restless, until it find rest in thee." There are many passages in his writings which indicate that in great moments of his life he arrived at That which is, "and in one flash, one leap, touched that eternal wisdom which abides for ever." Muhammad insisted that no proofs that God was real need be added to the testimony of his own experience that God was "nearer to him than the vein in his own neck." [5] St. Thomas Aquinas had a remarkable experience. While he was celebrating mass in Naples, he put aside his pen and inkhorn and never wrote another word of his unfinished *Summa Theologica*. When he was urged to complete his great work he replied: "I have seen that which makes all that I have written and taught look small to me." When a disciple asked the Sufi mystic Janayd of Bagdad: "I am told that you possess the pearl of divine knowledge, either give it to me or sell it to me," Janayd answered: "I cannot sell it for you have not the price thereof, and if I give it to you you will have gained it too cheaply, you do not know its

[1] *Psalm* xc. 2; cp. also: "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God?"—*Psalm* xlii. 1-2. Again: "O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is."—*Psalm* lxiii. 1.

[2] 2 *Corinthians* iv. 16-18.

[3] *Enneads*, IV. 8. 1.

[4] *Enneads*, VI. 7. 34.

[5] *Quran*, 50. 15.

value. Cast yourself headlong, like me, into this ocean (of God) in order that you yourself may find the pearl." [1] When we touch the real we are

Lost into God, as lights in light, we fly,
Grown one with will.

Religious experience is as old as smiling and weeping, loving and forgiving. The sense of God is induced in several ways, through communion with nature, worship of goodness, through

A sunset touch,
A fancy from a flower-bell, someone's death,
A chorus-ending from Euripides.

It ranges all the way from the gentle heightening of life to the intensest degree of ecstasy in God.

Any serious pursuit of ideas, any search after conviction, any adventure after virtue, arises from resources whose name is religion. The search of the mind for beauty, goodness and truth is the search for God. The child nursing at the breast of its mother, the illiterate savage gazing at the numberless stars, the scientist in his laboratory studying life under a microscope, the poet meditating in solitude on the beauty and pathos of the world, the ordinary man standing reverently before a starlit sky, the Himalayan heights or a quiet sea, or before the highest miracle of all, a human being who is both great and good, they all possess dimly the sense of the eternal, the feeling for heaven.

The religion of the truly religious is a simple one, without any shackles of creeds, dogmatic sentiments or supernatural elements. It affirms the reality of the spirit that broods over time and space. It has for its practical expression the maxim: "He that does good is of God." To do justly, to love beauty, and to walk humbly with the spirit of truth is the highest religion.[2] This experience is not confined to any race or climate. Whenever the soul comes to itself,

[1] Nicholson, *Mystics of Islam* (1914), p. 34.

[2] Cp. Einstein: "The individual feels the nothingness of human desires and aims and the sublimity and marvellous order which reveal themselves both in nature and in the world of thought. He looks upon individual existence as a sort of prison and wants to experience the universe as a single significant whole. The religious geniuses of all ages have been distinguished by this kind of religious feeling, which knows no dogmas and no god conceived in man's image; so that there can be no church whose central teachings are based on it. Hence it is precisely among the heretics of every age that we find men who were filled with the highest kind of religious feeling and were in many cases regarded by their contemporaries as atheists, sometimes also as saints. Looked at in this light, men like Democritus, Francis of Assisi, and Spinoza are closely akin to one another."—H. Gordon Garbedian, *Albert Einstein* (1939), p. 307.

in any land or any racial boundaries, whenever it centres down in its inward deeps, whenever it sensitively responds to the currents of deeper life that surround it, it finds its true nature and lives joyously, thrillingly, in the life of spirit. Through the birth of one whose consciousness is absorbed in the Supreme Spirit, the infinite ocean of wisdom and bliss, the family becomes pure, the mother is of fulfilled desire and the earth gets sanctified.[1]

There is no other source from which salvation can come to a world wandering ever more deeply into tragedy. All the primary spiritual data of the wide world of mankind have their foundation in the recognition of the real, spiritual unity of mankind, a unity to which the individual belongs in a stratum of his nature lying more deeply than that in which he belongs to any empirical community. The empirical barriers which separate us from each other cease to exist there. If we are centred in the spiritual reality, we shall be freed from the greed and fear which are the bases of our society which is anarchic and competitive. To change it into a human community in which everyone's physical and psychical advance is provided for, we have to enlarge our consciousness, increase our awareness, recognise life's purpose and accept it in our work. This extension of consciousness, this increase of awareness, are not easy. To know that reality is not apparent to us and that we are blind, and in our blindness we mistake the appearance for reality, is easy. But to cure the blindness, to recover the true sight, requires purgation of the self. We must free the consciousness from the distortion of greed and fear, from the illusion of egotism; and when we possess purity and single-heartedness, we get changed. We become what we see, are re-natured, understand the character and purpose of the world, and are able to live in this world as God wishes us to live. The aim of all creation is the evolution of human life, the re-making of man. We cannot hope to change human life and society without a change of human nature. Despite Aurangzeb's caustic comment on empty notions and wishful fancies, we need the light of the poet and the pattern of the philosopher, who, aware of forces that move the spirit, preserve for us the vision of a finer world within this world.

What we need today is a profound change in man's way of life. We help to secure the future only to the extent to which we are

[1] kulaṁ pavitraṁ jananī kṛtārthā vasundharā puṇyavatī ca tena
apārasaṁvitsukhasāgare' smillīnaṁ pare brahmaṇi yasya cetaḥ.



PROFESSOR S. RADHAKRISHNAN

ourselves changed. This self-change is not automatic. It is the response to the meaningful pattern we discern in history. It is a submission of the self to reality. It is the practice of religion. The mystic religion of India which affirms that things spiritual are personal, and that we have to reflect them in our lives, which requires us to withdraw from the world's concerns to find the real, and return to the world of history with renewed energy and certitude, which is at once spiritual and social, is likely to be the religion of the new world, which will draw men to a common centre even across the national frontiers.

Lecture II

THE INSPIRATION OF RELIGION AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Opposition to Religion—Fellowship through Religion—The Nature of the Individual—Contemplation versus Action—The New Order—The Dynamic of Democracy.

Opposition to Religion

If the world is in search of its soul, religions as they have come down to us cannot supply that soul. They divide humanity into hostile camps instead of uniting it. They emphasise the individual, rather than the social, side of life. By exaggerating the values of personal development, they discourage the growth of social sense and imagination. They stress contemplation more than action, theory more than practice. By their conceptions of the Kingdom of God they turn men away from their efforts to secure a better life on earth. They seem to have exhausted their spiritual power and become dead shells relying on a letter they cannot revivify. They cover their deadness by insistence on the observance of forms and ceremonies, to which habit and usage give more value than they deserve. They seem to be irrelevant to the sacrificial urge which is awakened, to the passion for service which is thirsting to find opportunity. On the whole they justify the present chaotic conditions, instead of inspiring us with the zeal for changing them. Marx believes that religion is an obstacle to the growth of a classless society, and the emancipated intelligences of the "brave new world" will be freed from the obsession of religion, as they realise that its view is a falsification of the scientific truth of the meaning, purpose and end of life. It is said that "the transition from the society which makes an end of capitalism to the society which is completely free from all traces of class division and class struggle will bring about the natural death of all religion and superstition." [1] This view of religion as superstition is propagated vigorously. "By May 1937, no Church is to be left in the Soviet Union. God will therefore be expelled as a mediaeval relic from the territory of the

[1] M. Bukharin, *The A B C of Communism.*

U.S.S.R." [1] After the pact of Friendship and Non-Aggression between Russia and Germany of 23rd August 1939, the Secretary of the anti-God movement in Russia declared that "the Russo-German pact would facilitate the atheistic propaganda, since Hitler and his Government are enemies of Christianity just as much as the Soviet Government." Now that Germany and the Soviet Union are at war and that Great Britain, who is leading the crusade against the paganism of Germany, has found an ally in Russia, the condition of God has become somewhat precarious. Political changes lead us to believe that Germany is godless and Russia godly.[2]

Fellowship through Religion

Even as the world is broken up into different races and nations, it is divided into different religions. East and West, Arab and Jew, Hindu and Christian, are unable to come to an understanding with each other. It was thought that belief in one God would make for peace and unity, but its interpretation that all men should believe and behave in the same way has caused more mischief than even the ambitions of kings or animosities of people. The aim of religion may be universality, but religions are local and particular and interfere with the development of fellowship. Even attempts to unite the Christian Churches themselves into a single religious community have failed, and the various sects continue to insist on their special formularies and rituals.[3]

[1] Decree of 15th May 1932.

[2] When Great Britain was anxious to be on friendly terms with the Central Powers, Italian Fascism was described by Lord Lloyd as "a highly authoritarian regime, which, however, threatens neither religious nor economic freedom, nor the security of other European nations." Hitler was represented as a god-fearing Catholic who stood against the anti-Christ of communism which "wrecked Cathedrals, murdered priests and nationalised women." In 1935 the Archbishop of Canterbury said: "More than fifteen years have passed since a godless tyranny was installed in Russia. Yet there are still thousands of bishops and priests in jail or doing forced labour in the mines of frozen Siberia." When Hitler attacked Russia on 22nd June 1941, "Suddenly the vanished churches filled, the priests were, by magic, restored to the altars; why, can we believe our eyes, there was Moscow Cathedral, back in its old place, and the Patriarch Gerges led 12,000 people in prayer" (Douglas Reed, *All Our Tomorrows* (1942), p. 84).

[3] Rousseau writes: "Religion considered in relation to society, which is either general or particular, may also be divided into two kinds: the religion of man, and that of the citizen. The first, which has neither temples, nor altars, nor rites, and is confined to the purely internal cult of the supreme God and the eternal obligations of morality, is the religion of the Gospel pure and simple, the true theism, what may be called the natural divine right or law. The other, which is codified in a single country, gives it its gods, its own tutelary patrons: it has its dogmas, its rites, and its external cult prescribed by law; outside the single nation that follows it, all the world is in its sight infidel, foreign and barbarous; the duties and rights of man extend for it only as far as its own altars."—*Social Contract*, Bk. IV.

Hinduism, however, represents an effort at comprehension and co-operation. It recognises the diversity in man's approach towards, and realisation of, the one Supreme Reality. For it the essence of religion consists in man's hold on what is eternal and immanent in all being. Its validity does not depend on historical happenings. The different dogmas give imaginative presentations of the basic truth of the divine in us. Our apprehensions of truth are formulated in ways determined by the past. For only the symbols that have been worn smooth by the handling of centuries can stir us to an apprehension of the Divine. The symbols are the concepts framed by the heart, thought and mind.[1] We cannot dispense with them, as they are the ways by which we envisage the eternal under the forms of time, the unchanging counsels of God under the forms of the changing world. The purpose of poetry, myth and symbolism is to serve as pathways to spiritual awakening and development. All creeds are attempts of the finite mind to grasp the infinite. They are valuable in so far as they help us to reach the ultimate goal. They are different because they are adapted to the different needs of the people, their race and history, their sex and temperament. But they are all tentative,[2] and so there is no justification for intolerance. Religion should not be confused with fixed intellectual conceptions, which are all mind-made. Any religion which claims finality and absoluteness desires to impose its own opinions on the rest of the world, and to civilise other people after its own standards. When two or three systems of belief attempt to bring all people into their own frames, they are bound to clash, for the world has place, if at all, only for a single absolute. We do not see the ludicrousness of these clashing absolutisms, simply because we are so familiar with them. When religious life is confused with the profession and acknowledgment of revealed truth, it becomes dominated by outward machinery. The priest or the church takes the place of the spirit, and subscription to the creed is the one thing universally demanded. If you profess the creed and join the group, certain

[1] hrdā' manīṣā manasābhiklptaḥ. Cp. *Ṛg. Veda*, I. 61. 2: hṛdā manasā manīṣā; also X. 177. 2.

[2] A well-known verse says: "O Lord, I have attributed in my meditation form to Thee who art formless. In my hymns, I have gone back on the truth that Thou art indescribable, O Teacher of the world. By resorting to pilgrimage I have denied thy omnipresence. O Lord of the universe, forgive me for these faults."

rūpaṁ rūpavivarjitasya bhavato dhyānena yat kalpitam
stutyānirvacanīyatākhilaguro dūrīkrutā yanmayā
vyāpitvacca nirākṛutam bhagavato yat tīrthayātrādinā
kṣantavyaṁ jagadīśa tadvikalatā doṣatrayam matkṛtam.

privileges and immunities belong to you and for ever. Compared with life, the machine is too simple, its action too obvious, its results calculable in an absolutely definite manner by means of census reports and statistics; but its influence is directed only to the surface of our nature. If we think that it is right for us to propagate our religion at the expense of others through the employment of force, on the ground that ours is a higher religion, we are guilty of moral contradiction, since oppression, injustice and cruelty are the very negation of spiritual wisdom and sublimity. Hinduism has no fixed creed by which it may be said to stand or fall, for it is convinced that the spirit will outgrow the creed. For the Hindu every religion is true, if only its adherents sincerely and honestly follow it. They will then get beyond the creed to the experience, beyond the formula to the vision of the truth. Śaṁkara, for example, speaks of six orthodox systems of religion. He had a comprehensive appreciation of different expressions of the One truth. Ibnal-Arabi writes: "My heart has become capable of every form; it is a pasture for gazelles and a convent for Christian monks, and a temple for idols, and the pilgrims' Ka'ba, and the table of the Tora and the book of the Quran. I follow the religion of love, whichever way his camels take. My religion and my faith is the true religion." [1] Rāmakṛṣṇa practised different forms of belief and worship. The religious value of Hinduism lies in the fact that it offers every kind of support to seekers of spiritual freedom, and brings them all to the recognition of the one transcendent truth which is variously expressed. Though the creeds are different, the tradition and the style of life are one. When we dispute over dogmas and definitions, we are divided. But when we take to the religious life of prayer and contemplation, we are brought together. The deeper the prayer, the more is the individual lost in the apprehension of the Supreme. The hardness of the ego melts; the tentativeness of the creed is revealed, and the intense focussing of all souls in one utter Being is grasped. We understand the essential unity of all religious quests, and discern the common experience under the different labels.[2] Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva are all included in the Supreme symbolised by Aum, and their followers worship the same

[1] Nicholson, *Mystics of Islam* (1914), p. 105.

[2] "Even as the rain waters reach the ocean, so also the worshippers of the Sūrya, Śiva, Gaṇapati, Viṣṇu and Śakti reach me."

saurāś śaivāś ca gāṇeśaḥ vaiṣṇavās śaktipūjakāḥ
mām eva prāpnuvaṁ tīha varṣapās sāgaraṁ yathā.

Supreme.[1] Though all roads lead to the same height, each man is inclined to set forth from somewhere in his own setting. We are all children of tradition and occupy a definite place in the stream of history. Hinduism is not bound up with a creed or a book, a prophet or a founder, but is persistent search for truth on the basis of a continuously renewed experience. Hinduism is human thought about God in continuous evolution. There is no end to its prophets and seers, no limits to its canonical books. It welcomes all new experiences and new expressions of truth. Light is good in whatever lamp it may burn, even as a rose is beautiful in whatever garden it may bloom.

We have to distinguish between religion, which is identified with adherence to dogmas and observance of ceremonies, and spiritual life, which insists on a change of consciousness for which all else is the means. The aim of religion is, to use the Christian symbol, the eternal rebirth of the Son by which the natural separatist selfishness is redeemed. If organised religion has not transformed the human race, its life and society, this is because it has not sufficiently emphasised that its sole justification is to open the way to spiritual existence. We can change human nature not by merely touching its surface by ideas, but by radical changes of nature. The common goal of all religions is spiritual life. They do not differ in their aim, but only in the extent of the progress which they are able to make with the aid of their varying lights. If we compare one religion with others, we will see that the differences relate to the formulas and practices. When we go behind dogmas and creeds and get down to the depths, we discover that all religions draw their strength from the same unfathomable source. The Hindu does not refuse to find reality in the Christian's description of his personal converse with Christ; nor does he discredit the assurance which comes to the devout Buddhist who follows the Middle way. He does not deny the Muslim's account of willing submission to the supreme Sovereign of the world. The recognition of this fundamental unity should make possible a certain measure of co-operation, on a common basis for the good of mankind as a whole. Even in regard to the theological formulations, there is now a possibility of wider uniformity. Like the nation states, the great religions arose and developed in restricted areas of the world when intercourse with the rest of mankind was difficult. But

[1] akāro viṣṇur uddiṣṭa, ukārastu maheśvaraḥ
makāre ṇocyate brahma praṇavena trayo mataḥ.

now, through the influence of science and trade, a world culture is shaping itself. All religions are now attempting to express themselves in a new idiom, and so are approximating to one another. Untenable doctrines are not so much refuted as set aside, and the universal elements of religions on which there is agreement are emphasised. This process will be speeded up in years to come, and the gradual assimilation of religions will function as a world faith.

The principle of toleration has been an accepted tenet of the Hindus. Aśoka and his successor Daśaratha patronised the atheist Ājīvakas. Manu requires us to uphold the usages of heretics.[1] Yājñavalkya recognises the customs of the heretics.[2] In short, the duty of protecting men of all creeds and none was enjoined on the rulers. The Muslim historian Khafi Khan writes: "He (Śivāji) made it a rule that wherever his followers went plundering, they should do no harm to mosques, the book of God, or any one's women. Whenever a copy of the Holy Quran came into his hands, he treated it with respect, and gave it to some of his Mussulman followers. When the women of any Hindu or Mohammadan tribes were taken prisoners by his men, and they had no friend to protect them, he watched over them till their relations came to buy them their liberty." [3]

The Nature of the Individual

There is a fundamental difference in regard to the nature of the individual between historical religions and totalitarian faiths. Religions teach that God is in man, that man is possessed of the power to choose between good and evil; and this power to make a choice makes him a man and distinguishes him from the animal, and lends sacredness to human life. The real unit of life is the individual with the beating human heart, the baffled human will, the sense of vast dignities and strange sorrows. Democracy is an expression of this faith in man and his right and duty to perfect himself, to govern himself and to build a society in which self-perfection is possible. The human being is treated by living religions as a sacred entity, whereas for Marx it is only "the ensemble of social relations."

[1] IV. 61. [2] II. 192.

[3] Such is the testimony of a hostile witness who records the death of Śivāji in the words: "On that day (5th April 1680) the Kafir went to hell." The notable recent pronouncement of the Nizam of Hyderabad is in consonance with this spirit. "Under me live people of different faiths and different communities, and the protection of their houses of worship has been for a long time a part of the constitution of my State."

He says: "The human essence is not an abstraction inhabiting the separate individual. In its actuality it is the ensemble of social relations." [1] Society is the reality, the autonomous individual an appearance or illusion. "To the Christian doctrine of the infinite significance of the individual human soul and of personal responsibility, I oppose," says Hitler, "with icy clarity the saving doctrine of the nothingness and insignificance of the individual human being and of his continued existence in the visible immortality of the nation." [2] In *Mein Kampf* he writes: "The dogmas according to which the individual personality has a right to its liberty and its dignity can bring nothing but destruction." Hitler defines the principle of socialism as the supremacy of the State over all persons, and the absolute control of the State by the Party; he says: "There will be no licence, no free space, in which the individual belongs to himself; this is socialism—not such trifles as the private possession of the means of production. Of what importance is that if I range men firmly within a discipline they cannot escape? Let them own their lands or factories as much as they please. *The decisive factor is that the State, through the Party, is supreme over them whether they are owners or workers. Why need we trouble to socialise banks and factories? We socialise human beings.*" [3] The human individual is emptied of his own history, of his destiny, of his inward past. He is regarded as an aimless, drifting, credulous creature who, without a mind and will of his own, is driven like cattle, or moulded like wax, by those who have elected themselves to be his rulers. If liberty is freedom to be our real selves, this anxiety to rid us of liberty shows the fall of man. This surrender of the human soul to the swarm makes us into a race of animals gifted with reason. For, in the animal world, the individual is less important than the race.

Natural rights, liberty of conscience, are proclaimed to be "liberal illusions" behind which the capitalist order lies entrenched. The dialectical process relates to the social substance of humanity. No individual can be good unless the social structure to which he belongs is good. To the religious thesis that we cannot change society unless we change men, the Marxian opposes the view that we cannot change men unless we change society.

We live in a world dominated by machines and natural science. Mechanical views of human nature are more acceptable. Psycho-

[1] *Sixth Thesis on Feuerbach.* [2] Hermann Rauschning, *Hitler Speaks* (1939), pp. 222-3.
[3] Rauschning, *Voice of Destruction.*

analysis looks upon human beings as helpless slaves of their subconscious impulses, capable of being refashioned by medical men. Behavourism looks upon the mind of the human infant as a perfectly blank sheet, on which we can inscribe anything we please. Human wickedness is traced to bad glands and unwise conditioning. The Marxist believes that the soul is wholly a product of circumstances, especially the social and the economic. Its acts of thinking, valuing and deciding are not the expression of its free and spontaneous activity, but are the psychological by-products of the social environment to which it is exposed. Marx wrote: "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary their social existence determines their consciousness." His successors reduce this view to a rigid determinism, and hold that consciousness is a mere epiphenomenon. When the circumstances change of themselves through the inexorable laws of history, individuals will change also. Social factors determine human behaviour. Spinoza had observed that if a stone falling through the air could think, it might well imagine that it had freely chosen its own path, being unaware of the external causes. Even so, ignorance of the natural causes of our behaviour leads us to think that we are different from the falling stone. But everything occurs as the result of the unalterable process of nature. Man is an object in nature, whose likes and dislikes are determined by conditions as rigid as those which govern the fall of bodies, the growth of plants or the rotation of planets. The ideologies of opposing schools are only rationalisations, or attempts to find specious reasons for actions which are really the resultants of economic interests. A mechanistic view which makes human actions blind and automatic is the result.

The contemporary scene inclines us to the view that we are the helpless victims of world forces which are proceeding to their appointed ends. We are infinitely less free than we imagine. In this hypnotised world most of us do things which we do not will. Fatalism is gladly accepted by men weary of their will. The world has become anonymous, and the individual is lost in it. In our educational institutions, instead of being trained to develop our powers and raise our intelligence, we are moulded into approved patterns, stuffed with information, and taught to produce correct responses to the stimuli of patriotism, racialism and religion. We behave like performing animals, animated dolls. The soul gets anaesthetised and we have faces without features. When we

think in herds we do not think so much as act on instinct. We become mass men hermetically sealed, repeating parrot-like set views on society, state, custom, law and individual. We are utterly unaware of the true significance of the human enterprise, and grow up into mentally undeveloped creatures, greedy for sensations, obscurely resentful and eager for something to blame and hate. There is a wilful impoverishment of men's lives. Family affection, love of home, reverence for elders are all dismissed as forms of spiritual slavery, rudiments from the Simian age like the appendix, from which we have to be freed. We are exhorted to apply brutal methods of violence even to our parents, if it comes to that. We are taught to believe in the fatality of history, the folly of resistance and the unimportance of man. We do not make history, but are made by it. The leaders use all the modern means of compulsion, of excitement and suggestion, to throw the masses into subjection. The feeling becomes general that it is no use resisting the trend of developments, that it is futile to counter a movement that proceeds out of the logic of the situation, that we must bow to the inescapable facts. The old doctrine of fate is dressed up in agreeable clothes and propagated by modern technique. The progress of applied science and technology, which is really the assertion of human reason over nature, has had the opposite effect on the ordinary man, in that it has resulted in the subjection of man to the machine. Human consciousness has become mechanised, and new automatisms are produced in the human soul. Most of us live lives without attaching ourselves to any high purpose, and not wishing to do so. We live from day to day, and disappear at last like rain bubbles bursting in the water. Life goes on full of idle fussing and endless talk. Most of us feel like trapped animals, made to acquiesce in a sense of complete insignificance in an entirely senseless world.

Is this the sacred heritage of freedom? Freedom is one of those words which it is easy to use but difficult to define. The belligerent nations in the present war declare that they are fighting for freedom and peace. The Indian National Congress proclaims that it is fighting non-violently for the freedom of India against imperialism. Our workers are convinced that they are fighting freedom's battle when they demand higher wages, collective ownership, prohibition, temple-entry. Freedom seems to be one of those portmanteau expressions, a sort of hold-all in which you can put anything you like. There is political freedom, or freedom of a people from conquest

and domination by others. There is constitutional freedom, or the freedom of a people from the tyranny of a class or a dictator; class privilege is an offence against human liberty. There is economic freedom, or the freedom from the constraint of poverty or economic pressure. There is legal freedom, or reliance on law. The laws that restrain and protect us have received our implicit or explicit consent, and so long as they are unrepealed they must be respected by all, small and great, in the community. It was enacted that "no free man should be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised or outlawed or exiled or anyway destroyed." Exemption from bodily slavery is also freedom. There is social freedom. All these, however, are means and not ends in themselves, the essential requisites to help us to realise the deepest energies of the human spirit. The chief purpose of social organisation is to foster the spiritual freedom of the individual, human creativeness, to help him to think, feel and adore as he chooses, without the constraint of oppressive laws and customs. Occasions may arise in which we may be called upon to sacrifice our rights and property for the sake of an equitable economic order. We may have to sacrifice national freedom for the sake of an international order; but spiritual freedom is an ultimate, an absolute, which can be surrendered only at the cost of one's soul. The *Mahābhārata* says: "for the sake of the soul, you may give up the whole world; *ātmārthe prithivīṁ tyajet.*" [1] "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" [2] We have in Socrates a supreme

[1] tyajed ekaṁ kulasyārthe grāmasyārthe kulaṁ tyajet/grāmaṁ jana padasyārthe ātmārthe prithivīṁ tyajet.—*M.B.*, I. 115. 36. ("For protecting a family one individual may be abandoned; for protecting a town a family may be abandoned; for protecting society a town may be abandoned, and for protecting the self even the earth may be abandoned.")

See also *Sabhā Parva*, 61. 11.

[2] But there is yet a liberty unsung
By poets, and by senators unpraised,
Which monarchs cannot grant, nor all the powers
Of earth and hell confederate take away:
A liberty which persecution, fraud,
Oppression, prisons, have no power to bind;
Which whoso tastes can be enslaved no more.
'Tis liberty of heart, derived from Heaven,
Bought with his blood, who gave it to mankind,
And sealed with the same token. It is held
By charter, and that charter sanctioned sure
By the unimpeachable and awful oath
And promise of a God. His other gifts
All bear the royal stamp that speaks them his,
And are august, but this transcends them all.

Cowper, *The Task*, V.

example of one who stood for the freedom of the spirit and counted it more precious than rubies and gold. In words vibrant with conviction and feeling Socrates says: "If you propose to acquit me on condition that I abandon my search for truth, I will say, 'I thank you, O Athenians, but I will obey God, who, as I believe, set me the task, rather than you, and so long as I have breath and strength I will never cease my occupation with philosophy. I will continue the practice of accosting whosoever I meet and saying to him, 'Are you not ashamed of setting your heart on wealth and honours while you have no care for wisdom and truth and making your soul better?' I know not what death is—it may be a good thing and I am not afraid of it. But I do know that it is a bad thing to desert one's post, and I prefer what may be good (death) to what I know to be bad (desertion)." [1]

No individual in organised society can be completely free. Civilisation consists in giving up less valuable for more valuable freedoms. Freedom of mind and spirit is the supreme freedom, which can be accorded to all without injury to any and for the good of all. The State exists for the freedom and the responsible life of the individuals. It consists of and exists for individual persons. Life is manifested in the individual. The world has its focus in the individual. Truth is revealed to the individual. He learns and suffers, he knows joy and sorrow, forgiveness and hatred. He enjoys the thrill of his victories and suffers the anguish of his failures. It is his right to live his life to the full, with all its ecstasies and shudders.[2] It is his privilege to be eccentric, wayward, unorthodox, nonconformist. The world owes all its progress to men who are ill at ease. Even the derelicts of humanity drifting about in the backwaters of civilisation, the underworld of criminals and outcasts, each has his own self inside him, his own peculiar interests and talents.[3] Though their nature may be baffling, chance and opportunity may bring about the best in them. It is the function of the State to see that the light of human recognition in men's eyes does not grow dim. Every human soul must achieve dignity and power, and have opportunities for generous ardour, lofty aspiration and tender compassion. No one will be like another, though each will

[1] See Bury, *A History of Freedom of Thought* (1913).

[2] "Alone a man is born, alone he dies, alone he reaps the consequences of his acts good or evil." (ekaḥ prajāyate jantur eka eva pralīyate/eko'nubhunkte sukṛtam eka eva tu duṣkṛtam.)

[3] "Brahman is in the slave, Brahman is in the sinner." (brahmadāsah brahma kitavāh.)

be striving for perfection in his own way. If for any reason whatsoever we compromise with this essential liberty, all other liberties will disappear.[1] The inviolable sanctity of the human soul, the freedom of the human spirit, is the sole justification for the State.[2] We cannot all be welded into one man, though we can be merged into one crowd. We are born separately and die separately, and in our essential life we live alone. The State must protect the dharma of individuals and groups.

Adherence to this view is partly responsible for the relatively easy way in which foreign invaders established themselves in India from early times. So long as the personal and social life of the people was uninterfered with, so long as the artists, philosophers and intellectual workers were allowed freedom to seek truth and create beauty, and the ordinary people could go on practising the natural virtues of body, mind and spirit, observe domestic decencies and enjoy the simple affections, the pure loyalties, the deep devotions which are the most personal, the most intimate and the most sacred part of human life, it did not seem to them of much importance who wielded the political sovereignty. Thought was always free, even when conduct was controlled by social convention.[3]

It is one of the illusions of modern life to believe that the way to spiritual peace is through material goods, that we can win men's hearts by offering them material benefits. It is assumed that, if everyone has complete material satisfaction, his desire for heaven and absolute values will be dissolved. But is there any material benefit more precious than life, any material catastrophe more awful than death? We are ruled by passions and ideals rather than by interests. There is more in life than economic values. We are men, not merely producers or consumers, operatives or customers. Even if the world becomes an earthly paradise dripping with milk and honey, even if cheap automobiles and radios are made accessible to all, we will not have peace of mind or true happiness. Men and women who have every comfort and convenience which a material civilisation can give them are feeling frustrated, as if they have been cheated out of something. Human beings live not for present ease,

[1] Cp. Benjamin Franklin: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

[2] Spinoza observes: "The ultimate aim of Government is not to rule or restrain by fear, nor to exact obedience, but contrariwise to free every man from fear that he may live in all possible security and employ his reason unshackled. In fact, the task of Government is liberty."—*Theologico-Political Treatise.*

[3] vicāraḥ svatantraḥ, ācāraḥ samājasamayatantraḥ.

but for the quest of impersonal ends, for the life of spirit; ātmarati, ātmakrīḍa. Āpastamba declares that there is nothing higher than the possession of the soul.[1] The spirit uncrushed by the machinery of authority, the light of God undimmed by the powers of darkness, is the hope of humanity.

We should not confuse two different kinds of happiness, outward and inward. If we are the favourites of the gods we move through life easily, with a glint in our eyes, with the world round us praising, admiring and loving us. We move, like children capricious and spoiled, and assured that it would be impossible for things to be other than they are. But when we are honest with ourselves, we know that what matters is not what the world thinks of us, but what we think of ourselves. Happiness is virtue, refinement, charm; unhappiness is ugliness, vulgarity, sham. Each one of us has a longing for the simple and the living, for a little friendship, a little human happiness, for devotion to a cause to which we can give ourselves. Any social order built on the ruins of spiritual freedom is immoral. Sin against property, against society, may be forgiven; but the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, as we do violence to ourselves by it.

Man, as we know him, with his body and brain more or less the same as he possesses today, has lived for thousands of years, a creature of the jungle and the caves, afraid of the night and the wood, propitiating demons and witches, indulging in gladiatorial shows, inquisitions, judicial tortures. Human civilisation is of recent growth compared to centuries of cruelty and savagery. Humanity and culture are not natural but cultivated, dependent on ways of thought. Taste and tradition are the products of culture. Instead of levelling down the structure of society to the standard of the mob, we must raise the mass to the level of true culture. Universal equality does not mean that everything is to be equally vulgar. The low level of the mass mind is responsible for the growth of tyrannies.[2]

[1] ātmalābhān na paraṁ vidyate.—*Dharma Sūtra*, I. 7. 2.

[2] In the Eighth Book of the *Republic*, Plato says: "Tyranny arises from no constitution other than democracy, severest and most cruel slavery developing out of the extreme of liberty." Nietzsche observes: "These new conditions of life that are calculated to level men down to an equal mediocrity—to produce a useful, industrious, herd animal type of human being, easily employable for all sorts of purposes—are peculiarly likely to give birth to a few exceptional men of most dangerous and fascinating equality. . . . My belief is that the democratised Europe will turn out to be a training school and a breeding ground for tyrants in every sense of the word."

Civilised man differs from the barbarian in his approach to life and truth. His opinions are formed by the calm consideration of the relevant facts and arguments, whereas the mind of the barbarian is at the mercy of passion, prejudice and catchwords of the moment. Mass propaganda works on the emotions, while individual suggestion appeals to intelligence. The disgruntled and the disappointed, the ambitious and the adventurous, the men of excessive vitality and the irresponsible youth who are fatally susceptible to the influence of hysteria and suggestion, dismiss the force of tradition as a cover for social privileges, and are prepared to sweep away the present order, to replace it by they know not what. As the moral resources are unorganised, the world is plunged into chaos.

Indian culture possesses the capacity for rejuvenation, and can without loss of continuity bring about a radical upheaval. Indian people, though somewhat slow-going, have the strength and vitality of youth, and so have preserved their culture. Their instincts react infallibly to the impact of realities. They are capable of effecting radical changes, not by the compulsory imposition of outward habits, but by the process of education and spiritual refining. Changes produced by the use of force could endure only if they were voluntarily accepted. The tendency of the masses to liberate themselves from the hold of tradition, even where it is sound and alive, and to develop emotional excitability and intellectual lethargy and passivity, should be checked. It is the only way to steer between chaos and tyranny.

To realise this freedom of spirit, liberty from physical and social constraints is essential. Liberty has been interpreted in two ways. There is the liberty which saves from social compulsions; the other tries to save us from material compulsions, to liberate us from wants which can be satisfied only through right economic and social relationships. Each is a means to the good life. Each, when complete, demands that society should not only protect individuals and groups from these compulsions, but also provide opportunities for achieving the values which the compulsions inhibit. While liberty may be defined negatively as the absence of compulsion, it is positively the means to the good life. It is the freedom of spirit that has moulded and remoulded institutions, and has given to our life and civilisation its ceaselessly changing forms. The history of mankind is the life of the unconquerable spirit of man, with its

endless variety of form and expression, all the different ways in which human nature seeks to express itself, its aspirations and adventures, its ambitions and achievements, its struggles and failures, through all of which the creative spirit of man is hoping, striving, failing, but on the whole gaining ground, advancing, never giving way, pressing onward; this free spirit is at the heart of human history.

Human progress has been achieved in the past by the refusal of the individual to sink his common sense and conscience in the neurotic herd. Life is resistance, digging one's heels into the ground in order to stand against the current.[1] One of the deepest causes of the disorder of the present is the absence of men and women who refuse to be carried away. All progress is due to the initiation of new ideas by exceptionally endowed individuals. Without intellectual freedom, there would have been no Shakespeare or Goethe, no Newton or Faraday, no Pasteur or Lister. It is the free men who create the mechanical inventions, which make capitalism and the modern State possible, and which relieve people from arduous labour and prepare for a different social order. The value of a society is to be measured, not so much by the sort of public order and efficiency it maintains, as by the degree to which its ways of action allow freedom of thought and expression, encourage moral decision, and contribute to the development of the intelligence and goodwill of its members.

Even Karl Marx, though he does not hold that the determined will of individuals can alter the course of history, and though he is convinced that the capitalist order will disappear from the stage of history, not by the deliberate retribution of the oppressed victims but by the inevitable processes of history, appeals to us in the name of reason. Insight into the nature and laws of the historical process indicates to us the right course. The destiny of man is to understand the meaning of the historical process, and to submit himself to the task of further manifesting that meaning. Our lives are validated by our becoming instruments for the final purpose. We must identify ourselves with the progressive class and act under its guidance. Though in this class struggle the victory of the proletariat class is assured, we can bring it nearer, and make the transition less painful, by our courage and determination. It is the

[1] Cp. Whitehead: "Life is an offensive against the repetitive mechanism of the universe."—*Adventures of Id* (1934), p. 102.

individual mind which understands the nature of the collective. In such acts of thought the spirit detaches itself from its unconscious immersion in the social collective. The individual cannot be dissolved completely in the social whole.

Again, how can we ask the individual to behave as a revolutionary, if he has no reality at all? If the tendencies work out with an iron necessity towards an inevitable goal, there is no point in asking us to work for it. When Marx asks us to further these processes by deliberate action, he is assuming the reality of the individual. He asks us to work for the future society, not as defenceless victims of an inexorable fate, but as responsible participants in a great task. There is nothing inevitable about socialism. If so, there would be no need of a social theory and of a socialist party. The large amount of propaganda, the blowing of trumpets, the shouting of slogans, the pamphlets and polemics, indicate that human actions are not automatic. If the theory of the Marxists were true, that socialism is the inevitable next stage in the evolution of society, there is no need for their indefatigable activity. All that is essential because they attempt to convert people to the creed. The propaganda is intended to influence our consciousness, which will affect existence.

In defending communism against the criticism that it will deprive us of our culture, the *Communist Manifesto* says: "the culture, the loss of which is lamented, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine." Marx does not think that the individual is a mere machine, or that the social millennium will arrive without human effort. When Marx protests against the capitalist system which destroys the *humanity* of the proletarian, when he denounces religion which defends and sanctifies iniquitous conditions, where workers are treated as worse than slaves or beasts of burden, he is emphasising the reality of the individual. No man can be deprived of his right to feed and clothe himself and have a shelter. As economic individualism has not succeeded in producing such a society, Marx rightly condemns the principle of *laissez-faire*. But a partial truth cannot be elevated to the rank of a whole truth. When once the material needs are satisfied, the individual must be able to think and say what he thinks, to seek freely the truth, or to create beauty, if he is so inclined. There are certain things without which we cannot live, and certain other things without which we should not care to live. A democratic society which alone can call

itself civilised rests on "the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties." President Roosevelt developed this thesis when he announced that the concerted efforts of the dynamic order of the future must be directed towards establishing and safeguarding freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear.[1] Freedom is a right to self-determination by a person in a society, and by a state in the commonwealth of nations. Its only limitation is the equal right of every other person or state to the same measure of self-determination. Without this freedom, whatever else we may have, we are dead.

There is nothing final or eternal about states and nations, which wax and wane. But the humblest individual has the spark of spirit in him which the mightiest empire cannot crush. Rooted in one life, we are all fragments of the divine, sons of immortality, amṛtasya putrāḥ.[2] In these bleak days we must fortify our minds with the great utterances and heroic deeds of the master minds of the ages. It may appear that we are today in a period of defeat; but even defeat is not without the dignity and intensity of desire. Faith in the lasting domination of the spirit in man is the light by which we can walk unfalteringly, even in the valley of the shadow of death.

If civilisation is to survive, we must accept that its essence does not consist in power, glory, strength, wealth and prestige, but in the free activity of the human mind, in the increase of moral virtue, in the cultivation of good taste and skill in the art of living. Marx condemned religion as a social phenomenon, as affording 'compensation' for social imperfections. There are some inexorable human experiences, like birth, love, death, which are essentially personal. The most complete establishment of economic justice, of a terrestrial millennium, cannot put an end to some of the most poignant of human miseries. The establishment of the social ownership and control of the means of production cannot put an

[1] "There is nothing mysterious," President Roosevelt said in his Message to Congress, "about the foundations of a healthy and strong democracy. The basic things expected by our people of their political and economic systems are simple. They are: Equality of opportunity for youth and others. Jobs for those who can work. Security for those who need it. The ending of special privileges for the few. The preservation of civil liberties for all. The enjoyment of the fruits of scientific progress for a wider community and constantly rising standard of living. That is no vision of a distant millennium. It is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation."—15th January 1941.

[2] Cp. deho devālayaḥ prokto yo jīvaḥ sa sadāśivaḥ.

end to human selfishness and stupidity, to the tension of the human spirit. Marx would surely not disallow the value of religion as a 'compensation' for the ills to which, not the social system, but human nature is heir. Social revolution, by itself, is powerless to struggle against the chaotic decay of our society. It cannot save us from the dehumanisation of life.

Contemplation versus *Action*

When we recognise that the individual has an essential side of his life to himself, that, even when men most frankly reveal themselves, there is still something beyond and out of reach, a dream unshared, a reticence unbroken, that behind all that we say or do, behind even what we think in the solitude in which dwells what we are, it follows that there must be certain activities relevant to this side of our life. We are active in society, but we are also solitaries, contemplatives who sink again and again out of the fever of existence into the quiet of self-communion. When we have our eyes set inward, we delight in the mystery of it rather than in the external incidents and excitements of life. The Upaniṣad says: "The self born had forced the senses outward; hence one sees outward and not the inner self. Some one who is wise, desiring eternal life, sees the inner self by turning the eyes inward." [1] Inward meditation is the way to spiritual insight.[2]

Pascal said that most of the evils of life arise from man's inability to sit still in a room. If only we would learn to sit quietly, we should

[1] *Kaṭha Up.*, II. 4.

[2] Plotinus writes: "... but what must we do? Where lies the path? How shall we come to the vision of the inaccessible beauty, dwelling as if in consecrated precincts, apart from the common ways where all may see, even the profane? ... Let us flee then to the beloved Fatherland. What then is our course? What the manner of our flight? This is not a journey for the feet; the feet bring us only from land to land All this order of things you must set aside. You must close the eyes and call instead upon another vision, the birthright of all, which few turn to use.

"Withdraw into yourself and look. ... Act as does the creator of a statue that is to be made beautiful. He cuts away here, he smooths there, he makes this line lighter, this other purer, until a lovely face has grown upon his work. So do you also; cut away all that is excessive, straighten all that is crooked, bring light to all that is overcast, labour to make all one glow of beauty, and never cease chiselling your statue until you shall see the perfect goodness established in the stainless shrine.

"This is the only eye that sees the mighty beauty. If the eye that adventures the vision be dimmed by vice, impure or weak, then it sees nothing. To any vision must be brought an eye adapted to what is to be seen, and having some likeness to it. Never did eye see that sun unless it had first become sunlike, and never can the soul have vision of the first beauty unless itself be beautiful."—Alfred Noyes, *The Last Man* (1940), pp. 150-51.

know much better the way in which it is best to act. All the great achievements, which are the pride of the human race, are the work of men who sat still and meditated on the theory of infinitesimals or the motions of heavenly bodies. It is the contemplatives, the idle strangers, the useless people who walk into a well from looking at the stars, who are responsible for the comfort and happiness of us all.

When religion emphasises contemplation, it is to indicate that there are certain inmost sanctities of human life which ought to be preserved. The aim of life is not merely to create an earthly Utopia, but to attain a higher and intenser form of consciousness. The pictures of Śiva, Buddha and hundreds of other saints illustrate the truth grasped by Plato, and Aristotle also, that the supreme end of man is contemplation, the freedom and the peace of understanding.

Marx identifies religion with philosophical idealism and contends that "hitherto, philosophers have variously interpreted the world; the real task is to change it." [1] Marx's followers explain this view as indicating the divorce of philosophy from life, theory from practice. Marx opposes action to the ecstasy in which mysticism is said to culminate. Instead of losing ourselves in the contemplation of the realm of essences, let us undertake action in the realm of existences, the concrete and the historical. In the *Eighth Thesis on Feuerbach*, Marx observes: "All the mysteries which drive theory to mysticism find their rational solution in human action and in the understanding of this action."

Besides, religion upsets the scale of values in the life of peoples. All things which, in accordance with the instincts of nature, had constituted the value of the present visible life, power and pleasure, wealth and fame, are treated with contempt by religion. That which is despised, what Nietzsche calls the slave qualities, obedience and humility, poverty and abstinence, are honoured as the surest means of attaining to felicity in the world beyond. Interest is transferred from the real world, known through the senses, to the world which is imagined on the strength of religious revelation. Anyone who seeks to improve conditions of life on earth is said to be snobbish and worldly-minded.

Marx is aware that Christianity, like other religions, utilises the hope of the poor and the oppressed for a better life. Life would have no meaning if the injustice of this life were all. So religions

[1] *Eleventh Thesis against Feuerbach.*

formulate the conception of a Kingdom of God, which the poor and the oppressed enter after death more easily than the rich and the comfortable. Only such a belief in post-mortem justice can make sense of our life on earth. So he remarks: "Religion is the sob of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, the spirit of conditions utterly unspiritual. It is the opium of the poor." [1] "The idea of God is the keystone of a perverted civilization," says Marx. "To suppress religion, which provides an illusory happiness, is to establish the claims of real happiness." [2] Engels observes that "the first word of religion is a lie." "Religion," wrote Lenin, "is one of the aspects of spiritual oppression." The helplessness of the exploited classes, in struggle with the exploiters, inevitably gives rise to beliefs in a better life beyond the grave. To those who all their life work and are in need, religion teaches humility and patience, comforting them with the hope of heavenly reward. Belief in God and future life detracts from devotion to ideals.

These comments are not without the spirit of religion, of understanding, of compassion. Why should the disinherited of this earth look beyond this world for a life of material happiness and comfort? The technique of machine production makes a better life for all men possible on earth. If only the hold of dogmatic religion is relaxed, the disinherited men and women, who have neither property nor security, will revolt against the capitalists who are so irresponsible for the well-being of their fellow-men, whom they use at the minimum cost and throw on the scrapheap when done with. Why should religion, instead of realising human brotherhood, ask us to submit to subjection? With a tremendous effort of religious imagination, Marx sees and feels that human society is a single, organic whole, and strives to oppose the supernatural, other-worldly religion. The destruction of the capitalist system logically involves the extirpation of all the institutions, ideas and methods by which the common people were deluded and enslaved.

Marx rejects the proposition that ideas govern the course of history. It is true that what makes history is not pure thought, but thought which applies itself to practical problems. Thought may have a social content, but it should not be a social product. It must be the product of disinterested reflection. The great ideas which move the world and exalt character rarely come from active

[1] J. M. Murry's E.T. See his *The Defence of Democracy* (1939), p. 38.
[2] *Nouveau Parti*, 1884.

public workers. They come from the poets and thinkers, the artists and religious teachers. They are conceived in solitude and meditation, and imply a self-sufficiency and freedom of mind to which active workers exposed to the strain and stress of public life can rarely hope to attain.

Thought is the essence of action. In the beginning was the word, and the word became flesh. Philosophy becomes history; culture civilisation. Plato and Aristotle contributed materially to the structure of Greek civilisation. Hobbes gave the impetus to the civil war of 1642, and Locke to the revolution of 1688. The French Revolution was the outcome of the philosophy of Voltaire, Rousseau and the Encyclopaedists. The philosophical radicals, Bentham and Mill, inspired the liberal programme of the nineteenth century. Marx himself gives an interpretation of the historical process, and all interpretations are intended to change the world. Life is governed by ideals, and philosophies are at the back of all revolutionary movements. What we are is the result of what we think. Philosophers are the creators of the future. The task of philosophy is not merely to interpret life, but to illumine and guide it.[1] Contemplation and life are distincts, not opposites. They can exist together.[2] They imply each other and work together. Again, we cannot change the social order unless we change ourselves. Our social order is as high or low as the character of those who compose it. A more effective social order means a different quality of men. To change the quality of life, we must be born again. Religions have failed simply because we did not take them seriously. Their chief aim is the remaking of man. Self-will, egotism, insisting on playing one's own hand, making one's own bargain, furthering one's own interests at the expense of others, are the sources of all frustration. Unselfishness, love of one's neighbour, co-operation, are the way out. How many have obeyed, or even tried to obey the law of unselfishness? If there have been a few individuals inclined that way, what shall we say of the mass of

[1] Cp. Chesterton: "There are some people—and I am one of them—who think that the most practical and important thing about a man is still his view of the universe. We think that for a landlady considering a lodger it is important to know his income, but still more important to know his philosophy. We think that for a general to fight an enemy it is important to know the enemy's numbers, but still more important to know the enemy's philosophy. We think that the question is not whether the theory of the cosmos affects matters, but whether in the long run anything else affects them."

[2] Croce: "two distinct concepts unite with one another, although they are distinct, but two opposite concepts seem to exclude one another."—*Philosophy of Hegel*, E.T. (1915).

selfishness? Knowledge is not enough to save us. Austere discipline, involving self-analysis and dedication, is necessary. The human individual is the meeting-place of light and shade, knowledge and ignorance. In him the divine has put on the robe of flesh. True being is limited by the necessity of individual existence. The two tendencies, one towards an isolated individual life and the other which strains towards unity and universality, are in conflict. To reconcile the two is the problem set to us, and it involves hardship and suffering, blood and tears.[1] The contemplative mystics do not charm the world into sleep and reverie. They are not above the *mêlée.* They are often militant in the secular order. They work with an intensity of purpose more clarifying and constructive than is the case with those lost in the world. Look at the magnificent succession of religious personalities who not only instituted religious orders, but exercised a very healthy influence on practical politics such as education and the care of the sick.

Marx's condemnation of religion as other-worldly is justified against certain one-sided views of religion. Though the proper life of religion belongs to the eternal order, still, as we are members of the earthly and the temporal order, we cannot evade our responsibilities. We are spirits, but embodied, and we must accept the conditions. We must not thwart our bodies, which are the instruments through which we register and enjoy the world. We need not pluck out our eyes to see better. To attain heaven, it is not necessary to deaden the senses or deny the heart. Physical happiness is a sacred aim. The *Yajur Veda* has it: "may we live a hundred years—a life in full possession of the powers of vision, hearing and speech, a life free from dependence. May we live such a life even longer than a hundred years."[2] The body is not merely the disguise of the eternal, but its necessary instrument.

The eternal truths, which give us sovereign rules of conduct for our lives, are to be realised on earth in social and temporal terms. Every religion has an ethical and social expression. Sanctity

[1] St. Paul: "To make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity in himself."—*Ephesians* ii. 15-16. Marginal Reading.

See also Cicero: "The natural constitution of the human mind is two-fold. One part consists in appetite, by the Greeks termed *horme* (impulse), which carries a man hither and thither; the other is reason, which instructs and makes clear what is to be done or avoided; thus it follows that reason fitly commands and appetite obeys."—*De Officiis*, Lib. 1, Ch. 28.

[2] paśyema śaradaś śatam, jīvema śaradaś śatam, śruṇuyāma śaradaśśatam prabravāma śaradaś śatam adīnāsyāma śaradaś śatam, bhūyāśca śaradaś śatāt.—II. 36. 24.

and love go together. Man is born a member of some society. His life is a network of intimate relations, of attractions and repulsions, from which it is neither possible nor desirable that he should cut himself free. Aristotle says: "He who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a god or a beast." [1] He has no place in society. Social relationships increase the individual's powers and opportunities, and widen his freedom.

The Hindu view does not neglect the worldly and the temporal. It recognises four ends of life: the ethical, the economic, the artistic and the spiritual. Its theory of the four stages of life emphasises the social obligations. Even as a monk one serves the world community. Work in the world is stressed along with contemplation. According to the *Īśa-Upaniṣad*, action and knowledge of the Supreme are to be accomplished jointly by the seeker for perfection. By action he passes beyond death, and by knowledge he attains immortality. A life dedicated to service is what is demanded. "Let my life be a life of dedication, let my vital breath, eyes, ears, intellect and spirit be dedicated to service, let my Vedic lore and understanding, prosperity and knowledge, be dedicated to service. Let the sacrifice itself be made in a spirit of utter sacrifice." [2]

The *Bhagavadgītā* declares that he who is devoted to the Lord is one who does not perturb the world, and whom the world does not perturb.[3] It teaches that only by love that gives to the uttermost, that refuses to flee, can evil be defeated and mankind redeemed.[4] The book opens with a problem of duty. It is a dialogue

[1] *Politics*, I. i. Cp. MacIver: "Social relations do not lie somehow between but only within them . . . they are not nets in which personality is enmeshed but functions of the personality of each, the fulfilment of which is the fulfilment of personality."—*Community*, p. 95.

[2] āyur yajñena kalpatām, prāno yajñena kalpatām, cakṣur yajñena
kalpatām, śrotram yajñeṇa kalpatām, mano yajñena kalpatām,
ātmā yajñena kalpatām, brahmā yajñena kalpatām jyotir yajñena
kalpatām, svar yajñena kalpatām, pruṣṭham yajñena kalpatām,
yajno yajñena kalpatām.—ii.

[3] XII. 15.

[4] If I can live
To make some pale face brighter and to give
A second lustre to some tear-dimmed eye,
Or e'en to impart
One throb of comfort to an aching heart,
Or cheer some wayworn soul in passing by:
If I can lend
A strong hand to the fallen or defend
The right against a single envious strain,
My life, though bare,

on a battlefield. The two armies are arrayed on the battlefield. Arjuna gazes at the enemy line, perceives his kinsmen and others to whom honour is due, sinks in his chariot and refuses to fight. Why should he kill his own kinsmen? If this problem of the duty of the warrior is solved, other cases can be similarly settled. The question which the *Gītā* tackles is not the problem of the right or wrong of war. It is the achievement of peace and integration through doing one's duty, whatever it may be. Its aim is not so much to teach a theory as to enforce practice. Kṛṣṇa says: "It was with work that Janaka and others came into perfection. Thou too shouldest do work considering the order of the world . . . as do the unwise, attached to works, so should the wise do, but without attachment, seeking to establish order in the world." [1] Again: "merely by not undertaking acts, one does not attain freedom from activity; nor does one attain success by mere renunciation of action." [2] "He who beholds in work no work, and in no work work, is the man of understanding amongst mortals; he is according to the rules a doer of perfect work. Free from attachment to the fruit of works, everlastingly contented, unconfined, even though he be engaged in work he does not work at all." "Casting off all thy works upon Me, with thy mind on the one Overself, be thou without craving and without thought of a mind and with thy fever calmed, engage in battle." The ascetic solution is no solution, for man is driven to work whether he will or not. Yoga is skill in action.[3] "He who does My work, looks upon Me as his goal, who is devoted to Me, free from all attachments, who is free from hate of any life, he comes to Me." [4] Work is undertaken, not on account of its external results, but for inner development. Karma yoga is desirelessness. Even work for the sake of society is not Karma yoga, but it is useful as a preliminary discipline. "The guided soul leaves behind on earth both good and evil." [5] It is no use putting on spiritual airs without developing spiritual qualities. Those who stand outside the world and become instruments of the Divine power do the great

Perhaps, of much that seemeth dear and fair
To us of earth, will not have been in vain.
The purest joy,
Most near to heaven, and far from earth's alloy
Is bidding clouds give way to sun and shine.
And 'twill be well,
If on that day of days the angels tell
Of me, " She did her best for one of Thine."—H. H. Jackson.

[1] III. 25. [2] III. 41. [3] II. 50. [4] XI. 55. [5] II. 50.

work. Mere rushing about, ignorant of what we do or how we do, is empty agitation. Only when we enter into the consciousness of eternity do we know what true action is. The world was built not through restless activity, but by peace and quiet. The ways of escape for the Upaniṣads and for Buddhism were only for the few, the sage and the ascetic. The *Gītā* brings deliverance to those fettered by Karma, by opening to them the way of action which helps them to attain freedom. For the old maxims of flight from action, or wisdom or asceticism, the *Gītā* substitutes "work free from attachment." Spiritual life is not a retreat from men and things, but is a consuming fire that burns away egoism, destroys bondage and penetrates everywhere. It is not the ascetic but the transfigured life radiant with power and energy that is exalted.

The fate of Socrates had a determining influence on Plato's vision. If such a fate could be meted out to a great and just man, is it any use interesting oneself in the world's business? From a world in which there could be no justice, purpose, good or truth, Plato turned to a world of ideas, the super-sensible world, and sought therein the supreme blessing. The Greek in him protested against this mood, and he exhorted even philosophers to take part in politics.[1]

Nearly 2500 years ago, the Greeks developed the idea that the rulers should be the servants of the people. Before qualifying for positions of authority, they had to renounce the idea of wealth, live frugally and austerely, and undergo special training. The training-ground was known as the Academy, and if an institution founded for the purpose of teaching a more practical endeavour than the Greek world has seen has succeeded in lending its name to unpractical life, it only shows the irony of human nature.

Unfortunately Christian ethics were never frankly a way of

[1] Speaking of a class of philosophers, Plato writes: "Such a one may be compared to a man who has fallen among wild beasts—he will not join in the wickedness of his fellows, but neither is he able singly to resist all their fierce natures; and therefore, seeing that he would be of no use to the State or to his friends, and reflecting that he would have to throw away his life without doing any good either to himself or other, he holds his peace and goes his own way. He is like one who, in the storm of dust and sleet which the driving wind hurries along, retires under the shelter of a wall; and seeing the rest of mankind full of wickedness, he is content if only he can live his own life and be pure from evil or unrighteousness, and depart in peace and good will, with bright hopes.

"Yes, he said, and he will have done a great work before he departs.

"A great work, yes, but not the greatest, unless we find a State suitable to him, for in a State which is suitable to him, he will have a larger growth and be the saviour of his country, as well as of himself."—*Republic*, 496.

life for this world.[1] The early Church treated life on earth as a short time of waiting for a new life, "when we which are alive and remain shall be caught up into the clouds." [2] The Middle Ages looked upon the world as a vale of tears, through which each individual passes to the vale of judgment. Only in a monastery or a hermitage can the Christian life be led.[3] The Protestant puritan attempt to enforce the Christian life on average men, living in the world, was a failure. To profess one rule and act on another has become the most obvious characteristic of the average life of many of us. Christianity compromised with the world. Sometimes Jesus' saying: "Render unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's, and unto God the things which be God's," is interpreted as permitting a double standard. Religion and politics are two separate realms between which a gulf is fixed, each with its own standards of thought, feeling and conduct. The realm of God has nothing

[1] For the lovers of life and the world, fascinated by the wide range of its vital and vivid interests, Christianity had no message. " One world at a time," they said. In his Gifford Lectures, Professor W. Macneile Dixon raises the question, " What has Christianity to say of love between the sexes ? " and answers: " Apparently not a word, or a derogatory word. The Fathers have little pleasant to say to women or lovemaking. They commend and exalt celibacy. Chrysostom spoke of women as a 'desirable calamity,' and we are all familiar with St. Paul's remarks on marriage. Yet here you have a subject which more than any other has occupied the attention of the poets and artists, indeed all mankind, a passion which is at the root of life itself, which exceeds all others in strength, of which, as Stendhal said, 'all the sincere manifestations have a character of beauty,' which has provided the kernel for all the great stories of the world with which every literature teems, which gives rise to half, and more than half, of all the pains and pleasures of life, plays a leading part in every activity, creates family relationships running through human existence like the veins through the body, omnipresent, entering into association with every side of our conduct and on every day we live, leading to crimes, treacheries, self-sacrifice, heroism, eternally occupying the thoughts of society and present in all its conversations. Upon this transcendent theme with its endless ethical ramifications, a strange silence reigns in the Christian documents." (1937, pp. 38-39.) He continues: " There is a similar silence in respect of the animal world. Their status in God's creation is overlooked. They are not thought of as concerned in the Fall, as sinful, as in need of grace or redemption or as having any share in a future life. Death, we are told, entered the world through sin, and though not partakers in sin, they partake of death and its consequence. Nor does it appear that they have rights of any kind, nor we any duties in respect of them. We may, it seems, treat them according to our pleasure." (*Ibid.*, p. 39.) In heaven we shall not meet our servants, birds, dogs or horses.

[2] Cp. the saying, attributed to Jesus, which is found in an inscription on one side of the archway of the mosque of Fatehpur Sikri: " The world is a bridge, pass over it, but build no house upon it. The world endureth but an hour, spend it in devotion."

[3] Luther writes: " When violence and wrong are done to you, say,—that is the way of the world—if you want to live in the world, that is what you must expect. You cannot expect to have things go better with you than they did for Christ. If you want to stay amongst the wolves, you must howl with them. We are all placed in an inn of which the devil is the host and the world the hostess, and all sorts of evil lusts are the servants and staff—and all of them are the perpetual enemies of the Gospel "; quoted in Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of Christianity.*

to do with the world of unregenerate men and their depraved social inheritance. A religious man can only tolerate it, put up with it; but as he is essentially a sojourner in this world, he must not get close to it, since he may be soiled in the process. But this is an unfair view. The things of Caesar should be related to the things of God. Spiritual values must permeate the world of life. Religion is not an opiate for the disorders of the spirit. It is a dynamic for social advance. Unless we have faith in an inner order, we cannot build a stable outer order. Religion is not so transcendent as to have no bearing on human life. In our moments of insight we understand man's final purpose, and are certain that it will prevail. Even if events happen that seem to defeat this cosmic purpose, we do not give way to despair. He who has a vision of the highest goal does his utmost to make it prevail. The understanding of the purpose of God lays upon us the duty of fulfilling it. The prophets found themselves in opposition to the established order. They were disturbers of peace. In the faith that the universe will back their purposes, they hurled themselves against earthly powers and suffered. All great achievements are born of suffering and sacrifice.[1] If we are lost in the world, we shall not be original, we cannot give a new mould to society or to human nature, we cannot make voyages of discovery into the unknown, our views on politics and society will be lifeless and machine-made. The truly religious will have a concrete sense of human realities. Hegelian idealism, which was the contemporary German substitute for religion, identified the existing Prussian State with the kingdom of God. The kingdom which is universal and eternal cannot be subordinated to an earthly state without treason to the kingdom of God. Guizot contrasts European civilisation with all others by observing that in Europe no principle, idea, group or class has ever triumphed in an absolute form, and to this is due its progressive character.

If the spirit is clear and the love profound, we may work in the world keeping faith with that high vision which we call God. The saintly souls are sensitive to man's suffering and feel life's burden as their own. Their patriotism is world-wide; warfare is for them

[1] Cp. Oscar Wilde: "Out of sorrow has the world been built; and at the birth of a child or a star there is pain."—*De profundis*.

One of the founders of modern Japan uttered a pregnant truth in two lines of Chinese verse as he was led to execution: "It is better to be a crystal and be broken, than to remain perfect like a tile upon the housetop."

a splitting of humanity against itself, utterly ugly, for loving kindness is highest beauty. We must use the supreme privilege of life in order that the creative energy of the universe may come alive in us, may clothe itself with our flesh, realise itself through our consciousness, and conquer the environment.

The development of religious life demands a withdrawal from practical activity in order to permit of the concentration of reflection, intellectual or emotional. Religious life is a rhythm of withdrawal and return: withdrawal into individual solitariness, which expresses the need for thought and contemplation, and return to the life of society. The movement of solitariness takes two forms: intellectual, leading to philosophy and theology, and emotional, culminating in art and mysticism. They are integral parts of the religious life, not separate and independent activities of the individual. Whenever we feel frustrated, our energy flagging, our power weakening, or we find ourselves on the edge of a nervous breakdown, we must take to prayer and meditation. Jesus' silences were directly related to replenishment of power. His nights of prayer on the hills, and in the garden on the Mount of Olives, were spent in acquiring strength. They that *wait* on the Lord shall *renew* their strength. "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength." They are the "creative hours with God," in the words of Madame Guyon. In the life of all dedicated persons we see the rhythm, the swing from stress and strain to quietude and reflection, from storm to calm, from strife to peace; and everywhere the new vision that comes in the solitude guides life in the storm. The men of vision weave their dreams into the fabric of actuality. Their attitude is one of victory over one's existence, not escape from it. It is not indifference that is exalted, but equilibrium. This world, which is a realm of discord, is to be redeemed by insight.

Both aspects, the individual and the social, are essential. The individual must never submit to that total annexation by society or by any of the numerous intermediate groups. The strength of society is derived from that of forceful individuals. If individuality is lost, all is lost. Modern man, without losing his social consciousness or conscience, must rediscover within himself a source of individual initiative sufficiently strong to cope with social despotisms.[1]

[1] The two apparently contradictory sayings of Aquinas are really complementary. The first is that " every individual is in regard to the community as a part is to the whole," and the second is that " man is not subordinated to the political community in respect of the whole of himself or all his goods."

The aim of religion is not reflection or ecstasy, but identification with the current of life, and therefore participation in its creative advance. The religious man transcends the limitations imposed on him by his material nature or social conditions, and enlarges the creative purpose. Religion is a dynamic process, a renewed effort of the creative impulse working through exceptional individuals, and seeking to uplift mankind to a new level. If social quietism, which is said to be the result of mysticism, is bad, economic fatalism is equally bad. Marx's main intention is to make us dedicate ourselves to the spiritualisation of the collective. By liberating the human spirit we make the world better in the only way in which it can be made, the interior way.

The New Order

Religion rightly conceived and practised will bring about a profound renewal, a peaceful revolution, "the conquering of abuses for the benefit of the deepest tradition," as a modern poet puts it. Man is at the beginning and not at the end of history, striving to build a world of love and charity, of truth and creativity, a world which has not yet been truly born.

Our religious leaders proclaim that they are engaged in a crusade. It is not for the first time that they announce it. They point out that if we do not win this war, if we do not overthrow the tyranny of Nazism, the world will relapse into a new dark age, where the power of science will be exploited by gangsters who will condemn millions to poverty and ignorance. They declare that Hitler's victory will mean an upheaval from ancient darkness, the re-emergence of savagery which will interrupt, if not set back, mankind's painful climb towards stability and ordered society. We are informed that this is a fight between Christian civilisation and pagan brutality, between democracy and dictatorship. On second thoughts we discover that the contrast is not so clear. The present order cannot be regarded either as Christian or as civilised, or as even truly democratic. The militarist tradition, of which we cannot be proud, is in every nation, legalising its crimes. The structure of wealth and privilege, resulting in great riches as well as great rottenness, which is found in almost all countries, is unjust. Race inequality is the basis of modern imperialism. We have developed a sense of property in populations, and conflicts among

those who wish to own properties become inevitable. Nations, instead of regarding themselves as potential members of a world community, are treated as mechanical forces which struggle with one another, and national policies are dictated by the anxiety to keep these forces in balance. We cannot have an enduring peace so long as these evils continue in what we call democracies of Christian civilisation, even if we overthrow Nazism. The military victory of 1918 demonstrates that it is not final success. If only our faith in democracy were followed by works, this war could have been avoided. In the years 1919-1939 the victorious powers sabotaged the German democracy of Stresemann, obstructed the efforts of the Disarmament Conference, emasculated the collective security of the League Covenant, and acquiesced in militarist aggression in China, Abyssinia and Spain, ending with Munich. Stresemann in his interview with R. H. Bruce Lockhart foresaw with prophetic clearness the course leading to this war: "He complained of the Western Powers, and especially of Britain. He had won 80 per cent. of the German population for his policy, he told his English visitor. He had brought his country to the League of Nations. He had signed Locarno. He had given, given, given, until his countrymen had turned against him. 'If you had given me one concession I could have carried my people; I could still do so today. But you have given nothing, and the trifling concessions you have made have always come too late. Well, nothing remains now except brute force. The future is in the hands of the new generation, and the youth of Germany which might have been won for peace and for the new Europe, we both have lost. This is my tragedy and your crime.'" [1]

Humanity is struggling to emerge out of an order which is played out. If we strive to re-establish the old, and do not discover a new basis on which human life is to be built, this war will be fought in vain. The new world, which is highly scientific and mechanised, requires a new mode of behaviour, calls for a fresh turn of mind

[1] *New Statesman and Nation*, 29th March 1941. John Middleton Murry insists that: "We English are supremely responsible for the conditions of Europe today. The responsibility for the starvation of Germany after the signing of the Armistice rests primarily upon us; upon us primarily rests the responsibility for the peace treaty, with its iniquitous and unprecedented clause compelling Germany to acknowledge that she bore the guilt of the war, whereas the guilt of it fell at least as heavily upon Russia as upon Germany. It is primarily our injustice, our betrayal of the principles of morality and humanity which we professed to hold sacred, that has conjured up the spirit of cynical savagery with which we shall in vain seek an understanding today."—*Defence of Democracy* (1939), pp. 246-7.

and heart by which we can guide, control and humanise it. We want not a programme for a party, but a way of life for the people, not a new set of adjustments, but a new conception of the purpose of man.

Setting aside all local and temporary issues, the problem of the immediate future is between the forces of materialism, which work against the practical realisation of human brotherhood, and the obscure spiritual forces which are working for it. Materialism is strongly entrenched in both the democracies and the dictatorships, in the temple and the church as well as in the office and the market-place.

What is the philosophy of life for which we are fighting? What is to be the structure of the community of nations which Britain, Russia and America will seek to create after complete victory? How would they enlarge the ends of governments? With guns and tanks, with planes and battleships, we may defeat the enemy, but we cannot win an enduring peace. We must let men see the right of every human individual to his own soul, and the right of every nation, weak or strong, small or great, to freedom of life and experiment. Democracy as a spiritual ultimate compels the transformation of society. If we are to develop a life of new beauty and meaning, it can only be the result of a fresh outpouring of spiritual force, such as occurred long ago in Egypt and India, later in Greece, China and Japan in the period following the introduction of Buddhism, and in Northern Europe in the two centuries of the Middle Ages when mystic religion became dominant. Only a faith can prevail against a faith.

We are all voicing the hope that never again shall such a thing happen. We used the same words when Napoleon was our enemy in 1814; in 1914 we expressed our disgust at the Kaiser and exclaimed "Never again." Today we are repeating the same words to the applause of our hearers. Every time we repeat parrot-like the words that we are fighting the great battle for civilisation, for mankind. Young men are deluded into thinking that when the war is fought and won a new life and warless world will lie ahead and their blood offering will not be in vain. There is no sign of these things. Unless men and women of understanding and conscience take charge of the world, we shall have no certainty of betterment, but only anxiety for our children, who will be forced to face fire and flame, death and destruction in their generation. What security have we that the history of the years 1918-39 will not be repeated? So long as we perpetuate the tradition of the City State of the Greeks, the

Chosen Race of the Jews, and the Nation State of modern Europe, we cannot avoid wars. Mankind is meant to be a unit. Men are not separate like so many grains of sand. We are organically bound into a living unity, which only the spirit of love can energise. There are differences of temperament and tradition; but this variety enriches the beauty of the whole. If the perception of the unity of the human race is dulled, if the awareness of the oneness of the moral law is weakened, our nature itself is degraded. Nations are forms of collective life which shape the flow of human history; but there is nothing ultimate about them. The demand for freedom made by nations which are politically dependent is intelligible. The rule of one race of men by another is inconsistent with the self-respect and dignity of the subject people, and so with the peace and welfare of the world. Besides, nationality is not an innate sentiment universal to human nature. It is most prominent in the European peoples, who are the products of four centuries of post-Reformation history. Again, nationality can be easily separated from political sovereignty, which is not a necessary adjunct of nationality. If each nation is sovereign master of its own will, if it is the final judge of its purposes, if it knows no law higher than its own, it will think in terms of power, and subordinate all other interests to those of the organisation of force. Any society of men animated by a feeling of solidarity is a nation. This feeling may, or may not, be rooted in common racial, linguistic, religious, historic, geographical or economic grounds. There is nothing fixed or permanent or definite about a nation. Some are shaped by tradition, others in spite of it; some by language, others not. Nations are made by the traditions of common history. History belongs to the order of value. It is a "possession for ever," as Thucydides calls it. Without the common experience of value, there would be no history. But for a richer and fuller life of the human community, separate nations, which foster cultural growth, are essential. "Men require of their neighbours something sufficiently akin to be understood, something sufficiently different to provoke attention, and something great enough to command admiration." [1] The moral validity of national societies is justified. Nations are natural and necessary forms, constituting an intermediate stage between the individual and mankind.

We are now in a period of the unity of civilisation. Till the

[1] A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (1928).

beginning of this century, on account of the difficulties of transport and communication, the peoples of the world lived in isolated areas with physical barriers of seas, rivers and mountains, and developed their group lives in independent channels. An ardent patriotism with love of the soil, and an ardent nationalism with love of the cultural tradition, were natural necessities for the development of civilised life. Primitive economic development fostered an attitude of hostility to strangers, which was thought essential for self-preservation. Today scientific inventions have brought the world into a close togetherness. Our knowledge, our habits of thought, our outlook on the universe, our most priceless possessions, come to us from all nations. Even if all these by themselves do not create unity, they create the conditions for it. This new increasing interconnectedness of the world requires peoples to come together on a new toleration and comradeship. We must think of ourselves as belonging to a single family, and must share a strong world loyalty that supplements, without supplanting, the loyalties to our nations. We are slowly becoming members of a single civilisation, so that our crimes are domestic tragedies, and our wars civil wars. When we refused to see the blazing horrors of China, the helplessness of the Ethiopians, the uneven contests between the Fascists and the Reds in Spain, when we tried to save ourselves by sacrificing the innocent weak and helping the guilty strong, we proved ourselves disloyal to the noble ideal of the oneness of the human race. In principle, however, democratic systems offer no justification for treating other peoples as outside the law, or as subhuman. The enlightened must identify themselves with the new social order that is struggling to be born. The vision of a brighter day for humanity is as much prayer as prophecy.[1]

New ideals must be embodied in new habits and customs, in the reorganisation of industry and business, in the redirection of all these processes, which are the hands and feet of ideals. The good life must actualise itself through laws and institutions. A limitation of the sovereignty and independence of states is essential for collective security. An international and equitable control of the vastly growing wealth and power, now in the possession of national states, is necessary. One of the discoveries of this war is that no

[1] A Sanskrit verse says: "The world mother is my mother, the lord of all is my father, all men are my brothers and the three worlds are my fatherland."

(mātā me pārvatī devi, pitā devo maheśvaraḥ
bhrātaro manujās sarve svadeśo bhuvanatrayam.)

nation can preserve its independent sovereignty. Even the mighty British Empire requires the help of the United States of America. Small countries are no match for the highly industrialised nations. Nations will be brought together in permanent political and economic combination, either of their free will or by outside pressure.

There are different schemes put forth about the post-war world. Some speak of the union of democracies; others tell us of the three groups of the Anglo-American, the European and the Asiatic. Our ideal should be world-wide political and economic international co-operation. The hopes of peace based on a great society are sounder than those of regional leagues. Our schemes must be courageous and comprehensive, not halting and piecemeal. "Let not England," said Milton, "forget her precedence of teaching nations how to live." The progress of mankind towards international partnership and political unity is the essential condition for the survival of civilisation, and it is for Britain, Russia and America to lead the way in building a world community of free peoples. The Churchill–Roosevelt declaration lays down the general principles of the peace settlement.[1]

[1] I append the Charter:

"The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

"First. Their countries seek no aggrandisement, territorial or other.

"Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

"Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

"Fourth. They will endeavour, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

"Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field, with the object of securing for all, improved labour standards, economic advancement and social security.

"Sixth. After the final destruction of Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

"Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

"Eighth. They believe that all nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten or may threaten aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten, for peace-loving peoples, the crushing burden of armaments."

The conditions of an enduring peace are there. It is assumed that no nation shall threaten by aggression the security of its neighbours. It is not enough to prevent attempts by force to change the *status quo*. We must make effective provision for carrying through peaceful changes in the interests of general welfare. At the end of the war, it will not be so easy to resist popular demands for vengeance, or national aggrandisement, or both. The Greeks who fought with such courage may ask for some aggrandisement at the expense of Albania. The Soviet Union, in the interests of security, may ask for the annexation of territory from Finland and the Balkan states. We cannot be sure that there will be no danger of imperialist encroachment by Britain in Africa or Asia. Restitution of territories lost by China to Japan and Britain, and by Ethiopia to Italy, will raise other problems.

The second clause is sound in principle. For the people subjugated by the Axis invaders, the real aim of the war is to win freedom from alien rule. If all changes are to accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people, they must have the freedom to choose their own future. This must apply not only to countries overrun in Europe by the Nazis, but also in Asia by the Japanese. How will Burma, Malaya and the Dutch East Indies be treated? Will Austria be free to decide whether to maintain the *Anschluss* or not? Will they have the freedom to choose their own course as nations?

Of course we must prevent injury to other nations. Nationalism is the principle which fused China into a unity, and which is also the dominating principle in India. We cannot allow racial or religious groups to prejudice the unity of nations, since nations would thus be broken up into unmanageable fragments. In case of difficulties and deadlocks within a nation, an international body which has the greatest moral authority should decide after considering the rival claims, and its decision must be binding on all parties.

According to clause 3, there shall be no interference with forms of government. Even Soviet Russia has renounced the project of world-revolution. Stalin's victory over Trotsky is the victory of socialism in one country alone over permanent world-revolution. His policy of friendly collaboration with capitalist countries is evident in this war. Bolshevism has become respectable. The

professional revolutionists are abroad, not in Russia.[1] Soviet Russia is not pledged to the extension of the frontiers of socialism. If we "respect the rights of all people to choose the form of Government under which they will live," we must establish our sincerity in this matter by conceding the right to self-government where we already have the power. "The intolerable degradation of a foreign yoke" is to be lifted, not only in Europe, but in every part of the world. Britain is mainly responsible for having brought India to the consciousness of her destiny as a nation. But to govern India by resort to special powers, by the exercise of undemocratic authority, by imprisoning representative leaders, even while we are proclaiming the right to self-government of all nations, indicates our enormous capacity for self-deception. Mr. Churchill, referring to the application of this Charter to India, says: "Britain was pledged by the declaration of August 1940 to help India to obtain free and equal partnership in the British commonwealth with ourselves, subject, of course, to the fulfilment of the obligations arising out of her long connection with India and her responsibilities to the many creeds, races and interests in the country." These historic obligations are utilised to continue British domination in India. The subject peoples do not have the right of self-determination. This war has made little difference to the British attitude on India, Burma, and the coloured races of the world.[2] When Mr. Churchill brought back the Charter, he hastened to explain that clause 3 did not in any way qualify British policy as regards India or Burma. Mr. Churchill said that it "did not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which had been made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India, Burma, and other parts of the British Empire," and that it was primarily concerned with "the restoration of the sovereignty, self-government and national life of the states and nations of Europe now under the

[1] At the second meeting of the Inter-Allied Conference in London, the Soviet Ambassador in London, Mr. Maisky, declared that "the Soviet Union defends the right of every nation to its independent and territorial integrity, its right to choose its own social form, and to choose such form of Government as is deemed necessary for the better promotion of its economic prosperity."

[2] A writer in *The Political Quarterly* (April-June 1942) says on the *Fall of Malaya*: "In actual fact, the colour bar, the instinctive dislike and distrust of coloured races, is unfortunately very marked among all classes of the English-speaking nations, and to believe that it is confined to the Blimps and to the so-called 'ruling classes' is to misconceive the problem" (p. 135). "The conquest of Malaya by the Japanese is due also to the grave shortcomings of the British Government's policy, or lack of policy, towards non-Europeans" (p. 136).

Nazi yoke." By ignoring the political ambitions of the Asiatic peoples, he is accepting Hitler's doctrine of a superior race. Speaking at the Lord Mayor's Dinner on 10th November 1942, Mr. Churchill made it clear "in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter, we mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire"; and yet we are told that Imperialism is a thing of the past. By a persistent mishandling of the problem of Indian unity and freedom, the situation in India has reached the danger-point. Declarations of leaders are worth little when policies adopted by powerful nations deny the common purpose of the whole world, and throw us into bewildered despair. Mr. Churchill should remember the wise words of Abraham Lincoln: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. Whoever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democrat." British statesmen talk of the new world; but all the time they attempt to bring it forth by the old means. It cannot be done. If they wish to win the war just to return to the old way of life, this "high crusade" has for its end nothing else than carnage and hatred.

President Roosevelt in his historic broadcast stated: "We believe that the rallying-cry of the dictators about the master race will prove to be pure stuff and nonsense. There has never and never will be any race of people fit to serve as masters over their fellowmen." And yet in his country we have twelve million Negroes who are prevented by race prejudice from taking any active share in the life of the nation. The social, economic and cultural discrimination practised against them shows that the liberty and equality for which they are called upon to fight are not meant to be applied to them. The treatment of coloured people in the United States, the social discriminations, and the exclusion of coloured soldiers from defence industries and trade unions, do not proclaim that America is all out for democracy and race equality. Again, the Act constituting the South African Union denied the franchise to the large bulk of the population, the natives of South Africa. In territories under the direct jurisdiction of the Imperial British Government, such as Kenya, racial injustice is a growing evil. A small racial immigrant minority has established a domination quite as absolute, even if it is not so obtrusive, as anything the Nazis could desire. The law and administration relating to land, labour and taxation limit the independent economic opportunity of

the Africans, compel them to work as unpaid labourers in European enterprises, and prevent them from rising out of their dependent position, while they protect the political, social and educational privileges of the minority. To despise other races as inferior, as the Nazis do, is one thing; to despise them in practice, while pretending to treat them as equals, is worse.[1] The former is at least honest and straightforward; the latter, which combines contempt with condescension, is certainly dangerous. When Japan proposed to insert the principle of racial equality in the terms of the Covenant of the League of Nations, President Wilson opposed it, and obtained the support of the British delegation. Mr. Attlee, no doubt, emphasised that the declaration of principles which he had made the day before applied to all the races of the world.[2] The relinquishment of the extra-territorial rights enjoyed by Great Britain and the United States in China has been a great step; and if it is followed by the doing away with the invidious ban placed on Asiatics acquiring citizen rights in the United States, it will proclaim freedom from racial prejudice on the part of the people of the United States.

A world broken by past conquest, and maintained by present force, leads inevitably to wars. If the slain in this war are not to have died in vain, if the peace at the end is not to call forth continual resistance and longing for revenge, if subject nations are not to languish in their bondage, if hate and despair are not to be aroused in men's minds, the wrongs done in the past must be righted, and international protection must be secured for the life and liberty of all nations. If the victory is used to justify existing arrangements, which favour a few individuals and nations, it is only greed employing murder to achieve its brutal ambitions. The conscience of the civilised world demands and expects the settlement of the outstanding problems of colonies and dependencies in a spirit of equity and detachment.

[1] Jacques Maritain says: "Nothing does more harm to the progress of Christianity and is more against its spirit than . . . race prejudice amongst Christians. . . . There is nothing more widely spread in the Christian world."

[2] Speaking at a reception given in his honour by West African students in London, Mr. Attlee said: "You will not find in the declarations which have been made on behalf of the Government of this country on the war, any suggestion that the freedom and social security for which we fight should be denied to any of the races of mankind. . . . We of the Labour Party have always been conscious of the wrongs done by the white races to those with darker skins. We have been glad to see how with the passing of years the old conception of colonies as places inhabited by inferior people, whose function was only to serve and produce wealth for the benefit of other people, has made way for juster and nobler ideas."

Again, the form of the constitution is to be chosen by the people; but nations cannot have in the new world the right to be judges in their own cause. Any system of general security will restrict the right of increase of armaments and the rights of other nations. Certain minimum standards, which will secure "freedom from fear and want," will have to be set up for all nations. These cannot be regarded as purely domestic concerns. We require an international authority to formulate and enforce a scheme of elementary human rights, such as freedom to know and to express opinion, freedom of worship, freedom of association, freedom from racial persecution. The securing of equal rights for all nations, "great and small, victor or vanquished," can be enforced, if at all, by an international authority with wide powers and functions in the economic field. We must prevent trade wars. Mr. Churchill said: "Instead of trying to ruin German trade by all kinds of additional trade barriers and hindrances, as was the mood of 1917, we have definitely adopted the view that it is not in the interests of the world and our two countries (Britain and U.S.) that any large nation should be unprosperous, or shut out from the means of making a decent living for itself and its people by its industry and enterprise." Clause 5 envisages an economic commonwealth for all who accept its principles. It proposes to displace the present economic anarchy by order. The interests of economically backward peoples will also be a matter for discussion. Economic imperalism will have to be discouraged. The weak must be protected against abuse by the strong.

The next clause insists on collective security against aggression. Freedom of the seas is mentioned in the next clause, and the last emphasises the need for abandoning the use of force as an instrument of national policy. We will not let any nation acquire the strength to wage aggressive war against her neighbours. To implement it, a number of things will have to be devised: the conference method, constructive work, economic, social, intellectual and spiritual, provision for peaceful settlement of international disputes, changes of existing rights by arbitration, all-round reduction of armaments, and effective preparation for collective defence against aggression. The period after the war will be one of world convalescence, and the victors should hold in trust the power to hasten the recovery.

The fundamental principles which should shape the new civilisation have been set forth in a letter to *The Times*, signed by

the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council and the Archbishop of Westminster, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain. They are:

(1) The right of all nations to independent existence.
(2) Disarmament.
(3) Some juridical institution to guarantee and, when necessary, revise and correct international agreements.
(4) Adjustment, as required, of just demands of nations' populations and minorities.
(5) The peoples and rulers to be guided by universal love.

To these basic principles, the letter adds five:

(1) Extreme inequality in wealth and possessions should be abolished.
(2) Equal educational opportunities for every child.
(3) The family as a social unit must be safeguarded.
(4) The sense of a divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work.
(5) The resources of the earth must be used for the whole of the human race and with due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations.

Stalin declared in his Address to the Moscow Soviet, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Soviet Revolution, the war aims:

"The programme of the Italo-German coalition can be characterised as follows:—racial hatred, the supremacy of chosen nations, the subjugation of other nations by the seizure of their territories, the economic enslavement of conquered nations, deprivation of their national wealth, the destruction of democratic liberty and the establishment of a Hitlerite regime everywhere. The programme of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition is the abolition of racial exclusiveness, the equality of nations and the inviolability of their territory, the liberation of enslaved nations and the restoration of their sovereign rights, the right of establishing whatever regime they like, economic assistance to the countries which have suffered and help to be given them in achieving material welfare, the restoration of democratic liberty and the destruction of the Hitlerite regime." After the defeat of Germany and Japan, Russia will be in a powerful position, and the safety of the world requires an

alliance in peace of America, Russia and Great Britain for the welfare, not the domination, of the world. Any settlement which does not reckon with Russia and her professed aims will only lead to another world war in more dangerous conditions. Russia's freedom from race prejudice makes a strong appeal to the Asiatics and the coloured peoples of the world.

It is not enough to win the war if we revert to hunger, fear and frustration after victory. It is a conflict between light and darkness, between the achievement of a real austere civilisation and the lapse into barbarism through super-dictatorships, which will hold mankind in diabolic subjection until the race descends to such a level of degeneracy as finally to be exterminated.

We are at the end of an epoch, and the world will never again be put together on the pre-war pattern. If the hopes of the young who are sacrificing their lives are not to be betrayed again, if this is not to be another war without hope of any betterment for mankind, we must release the world from the malign influence of selfishness, individual and collective. The nations must feel the shame of their misdeeds. The way the world moves forward is through repentance. Out of all the blood and chaos of these times a new and better era may come. A mere political and economic organisation will not do, if human society is to function as a live reality. It is an organism, not an organisation. It is a living, growing thing. The breath of spirit must be breathed into it. The human community must become the organic expression of the faith in the oneness of the creative Spirit of the Universe, and in a sense of fellowship. There is an immortal aspiration inhabiting every human frame, a universal consciousness expressing itself in limited minds and divided egos. Truth alone conquers, not falsehood; whatever events may befall us, the light of truth will not go out.

The Dynamic of Democracy

Democracy is the political expression of the ethical principle that the true end of man is responsible freedom. Kant's celebrated moral principle, "So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, always as an end, never merely as a means," is a formulation of the democratic faith. In principle, democracy is ethical and therefore universal. It knows no bounds but those of life itself. Vyāsa says: "May all beings be happy;

may all attain bliss, may all see happy days, may no one be subject to suffering." [1] Not for nothing did Blake include in his poem *The Divine Image* the verse:

For all must love the human form,
In heathen, Turk or Jew;
Where mercy, peace and pity dwell,
There God is dwelling too.

The aim of democracy is always the interest of society as a whole, not of any class or community. All individuals, whatever be their race or religion, should be received into political society solely on the ground of their common humanity. Each adult individual member of society has the right to an equal share in the political power of the society. When we say all men are equal, we mean that all men are centres of absolute value. We cannot hold that we are of absolute value, while others possess only a derivative and instrumental value as possible means to the satisfaction of our ends. So far as our instrumental value is concerned we are unequal. As we have different capacities, we assume different functions which we fulfil with different degrees of efficiency. Yet every one should find a place in the social organism. The controversy about the equality of all men is due to a failure to make the distinction between intrinsic and instrumental values. All men are equal in regard to their intrinsic value, but unequal in regard to their instrumental values. Democracy is the rule of the people only in the sense that the people include all members of the society. It is entirely opposed to the suppression of minorities and minority opinion. If a minority is suppressed or silenced, then democracy becomes a tyranny.

Pericles in 431 B.C., in the "Funeral Oration," explained his conception of democracy. "We are called a democracy because our administration rests not with the few but with the many. In their private disputes all men are equal before the law, but before public opinion men are accorded honour not for their rank but for their merit, and howsoever poor a citizen may be, howsoever lowly and obscure, he is not thereby debarred from a public career if he has it in him to render service to the city. If we enjoy freedom in public life, we enjoy no less freedom in our private affairs. What is more, we do not resent our neighbour's pleasure, nor pull long faces over it, which may be a harmless expression of disapproval,

[1] sarve ca sukhinaḥ santu, sarve santu nirāmayāḥ
sarve bhadrāṇi paśyantu mā kaścid duhkhabhāg bhavet.

but is not therefore less disagreeable. We try to behave ourselves in private and in public. We have a deep respect for those in authority and for the laws, especially those laws which have been ordained for the benefit of the oppressed and for those unwritten laws which disgrace the breaker of them in the eyes of his fellow-men."[1] Yet by the pressure of events, Pericles was obliged to depart from, even to deny, his principles. The Athenian civilisation depended on those large numbers who were not citizens, on women and slaves. Pericles was satisfied so long as the citizens of Athens had equal opportunities of taking part in the government of the State, and had equality before the law.

The American Declaration of Independence of 4th July 1776 has these exalted sentiments: "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights; that among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that, to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organising its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." If we remove the theological reference, and the unscientific claim that all men are created equal, we get here the essential principle of democracy: that all men should have equal opportunity to be free and happy. This equality of opportunity implies the right to the material resources. It requires that all men, including Negroes and women, should be provided with those conditions without which happiness is unattainable. No government till today has succeeded in implementing this principle. Athenian democracy was based on the system of slavery. The Middle Ages had serfdom. We have, today, the upper and the lower classes, the rich and the poor. It is a tragic reflection that the great civilisations were raised on the basis of slavery and serfdom. Greece and Rome had large slave populations. Mediaeval France and Renaissance Italy were supported by serfs, tied to the soil as cultivators and enjoying mere subsistence. Modern civilisation has a background of poverty, squalor and hardship.

The French Revolution of 1789 influenced the climate of thought,

[1] Compton Mackenzie, *Pericles* (1937), p. 311.

and it is today impossible to deny, in theory at least, the claim of the poor and ignorant to be free and happy. The cynic, commenting on the three principles popularised by the French Revolution, says that Liberty means "I can do as I like"; Equality means "You are no better than I am"; and Fraternity, "What is yours is mine if I want it." It has led to anarchy, mediocrity and interference.

The *Communist Manifesto* (1848) stands for an ideal of a community of individuals, associated together in such a way that "the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all." The *Manifesto* is right in insisting on a proper distribution of wealth. Whether it requires economic equality, in the sense that no one's income should exceed anyone else's, is a different question. The economic order should be such as to permit all men to have a chance of living free and happy lives. The abstract value of democracy, as an ethical value, the vision of a good life, must be filled by a concrete content. The spirit must give itself existence. The equal possession of the franchise is the outward sign of a vital truth, which we must realise in our lives. The aim of political democracy is to recognise the rights of man in regard to political power. To enable all men to possess an equal share of the advantages of society is the aim of social democracy.

Poverty and suffering ennoble only when they are self-imposed. Those who tell us that poverty is the best spur of the artist have not themselves felt the iron of it in their souls. Many of our spiritual possibilities do not get a chance when we live in conditions of sweated labour or acute poverty. Those who live in overcrowded houses, in the midst of dirt and disease, suffering from hunger and cold, may develop a sort of stoic endurance and resignation, but cannot make any creative contributions. Poverty is responsible for diseased bodies and frustrated lives. The inequalities of wealth are a social disease like slavery. There is a good deal to be said for Aristotle's view that the perfect life postulates, as its condition, that a man should be sufficiently provided with the necessities if he is to be free to pursue things of the mind.[1] Though economic goods are

[1] Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch says: "Nine out of the twelve great poets of the last century were University men. It is, however, dishonouring to us as a nation—certain that, by some fault of our Commonwealth, the poor poet has not in these days, nor has had for two hundred years, a dog's chance. Believe me—and I have spent a great part of the last ten years in watching some 320 elementary schools—we may boast of democracy, but actually, a poor child in England has little more hope than the son of an Athenian slave to be emancipated with that intellectual freedom of which great writings are born."—*On the Art of Writing.*

not among the great ends of life, they are among the indispensable means. The moral degradation caused by poverty is thus described by an Indian poet Bhartṛhari in his *Nītiśataka*: "All those identical sense organs, the same actions, the same undamaged intellect, the same speech; yet without the warmth of wealth, the same man becomes quite different in an instant."[1] Minimum economic security is essential if one has to preserve one's dignity, to walk unhampered, to be generous, frank and independent. In his Fireside Talk of December 1940 Mr. Roosevelt said: "I would ask no one to defend a democracy which in turn would not defend every one in the nation against want and privation." The responsibility of each for all should be recognised in any sound social scheme. Traditional individualism does not deal adequately with the individual's social obligations. If we believe that we have an unconditional right to the things we receive, and have no obligation to render back some equivalent, we are sadly mistaken. We realise our freedom only when we act as members with responsibilities to one another. Society in return protects and secures us in our effort. Mr. Churchill, when he became Prime Minister, told the boys of his old school, Harrow, that when the war was won, "it must be one of our aims to work to establish a state of society where the advantages and privileges, which hitherto have been enjoyed only by the few, shall be far more widely shared by the men and youth of the nation as a whole." In the present order these advantages and privileges are restricted to a small class, interrelated by blood or marriage or common interest with a sprinkling of new entrants, who purchase their tickets of admission into the select group by money.

There is a frightful homogeneity about the economic situation in almost all countries. A small minority of the population enjoy the benefits while the large majority suffer from privation, de-

[1] tānīndriyāṇi sakalāni tad eva karma, sā buddhir apratihatā
vacanaṁ tad eva
arthoṣmaṇā virahitaḥ puruṣaḥ sa eva tvanyaḥ kṣaṇena bhavatīti
vicitram etat.
yasyāsti vittaṁ sa naraḥ kulīnaḥ
sa paṇḍitaḥ sa śrutavān sa guṇajñaḥ
sa eva vaktā sa ca darśanīyaḥ
sarve guṇāh kāñcanam āśrayanti.

Cp. Bernard Shaw: "Money is the most important thing in the world. It represents health, strength, honour, generosity, and beauty, as the want of it represents illness, weakness, disgrace, meanness and ugliness. Not the least of its virtues is that it destroys base people, as certainly as it fortifies and dignifies noble people."

pendence and consequential physical and mental ills.[1] In the present organisation of society, the demand for equality of opportunity means the suppression of socially irresponsible ownership, and control of the instruments of collective production. The fact of ownership carried with it the power to command, and relations of superior and inferior develop. The master class owes its superior fortune to the exploitation of the labourer's dependent position, even as the old feudal nobility or slave-owning aristocracy derived its power from the surplus labour of the serf or the slave. The 'money power' in politics is the greatest danger to peace. Production for profit must be replaced by production for use. It can be done by competent collective direction. The workers and the peasants cannot be satisfied with the crumbs which fall from the capitalist's table, from their self-indulgent charity, such as old age pensions, health and unemployment insurance, minimum wages. If the capitalists attempt to smash the political instrument by means of which the transfer of economic power is effected, it provokes a counter-attack. Communism is an attack on the institution of property without human obligations. The process of adaptation, which is essential for the survival of any society, has dangerously slowed down. It is no use clinging to old forms at a time when history is rushing. If we do so, we shall be swept away. Inertia in the face of intolerable injustice and outrageous wrong is immoral. There is more pity for the bird whose wings are broken, and can no longer fly, than for the unfortunate man who is thrown aside in the struggle for life. Our laws and institutions have not given protection to those who most need it. They bind the wage-earners with fetters as strong as those riveted to slaves. They define with precision the rights of the strong and the wealthy, and are indifferent to those of the poor and the weak. They have been unkind to the unfortunate, and unfair to the infant. Some sensitive and exquisite human natures find nothing but emptiness and torture within the confining walls of a social system which specialises in smothering spontaneity, mocking dreams and extinguishing happiness.

[1] Cp. Trotsky: " With 6 per cent. of the world's population, the United States of America holds 40 per cent. of the world's wealth." Still, one-third of the nation, as Roosevelt himself admits, is undernourished, inadequately clothed, and lives under subhuman conditions. In *Modern Co-operation and Private Property*, Bearle and Means point out that about 50 per cent. of the production of the U.S.A. was effectively in the hands of less than 2000 people.

There are few moods of the spirit more worthy of cultivation than those in which we reverence our tragic and bewildered race. An elemental sense of community is promoted by them. If our democracy is sound, we will work for a social structure which assures work and security to all adults, proper education for the young for the development of their special capacity, a widespread distribution of the necessities and amenities of life, full safeguards against the distress of unemployment and freedom of self-development.

The democratic sentiment which became dynamic with the French Revolution produced the equalitarian urge, which soon combined with the equally fundamental urge for the raising of the standard of life for all men. So democracy grew militant, and jealous not only of those who enjoyed ancestral privileges of wealth, power and rank, but also of those who, by their own energy and enterprise, made a more profitable thing of life than their less gifted fellows. As wealth went with power, it became the object of attack, irrespective of the consideration whether it was inherited from ancestors or acquired by one's own effort. The Russian revolution, which aimed at the abolition of privileges and inequalities of wealth, tried the experiment of offering equal rewards to all kinds of work, on the ground that they were all essential to the community, but it did not work. The communist maxim: "from each according to his powers, to each according to his wants," did not establish equality in any real sense. Except a few doctrinaire enthusiasts, ordinary people did not exert themselves to their utmost. So long as services of varying difficulty and value were rewarded as of equal worth, there was a temptation to be content with soft jobs. The result was slack work. A change was made, and salaries are now in proportion to the value and difficulty of the services rendered to the community. Thus differences are established, since those who are paid better acquire greater power and are treated with greater dignity. Class distinctions arise. The bureaucracy of skilled directors, the managers of industrial economy with capacity and ambition, control the proletariat; and keen competition to get into the inner circle arises. Reckless ambition to get ahead of others, blind passion, craftiness, vulgarity, and other essential weaknesses of human nature obtain a chance. Instead of the traditional aristocracy or the capitalist ring, we have the powerful bureaucracy. The old feelings of jealousy and hatred directed against kings and nobles, priests and capitalists, are now turned

against commissars and dictators. We cannot by legislation abolish the tendency of nature towards inequality. Any society has a functional hierarchy. Those who wield power may do so in a spirit of service to the community. A classless society is impracticable, and if the fluid class which holds power is to use it in the right spirit it depends not on external controls, but on inner cultivation. If the spirit of humility is to be developed in those who wield power, it cannot be achieved through an approximation to equality of income. Only good breeding, and the active control of the religious conscience, can prevent the pride of power and the abuse of privilege. The change necessary is not in the surface of things, but in the foundations of human nature. The State must become the instrument of true civilisation, and educate its members to an entirely new conception of social responsibility. If we believe in religious discipline for achieving this end, we need not be looked upon as soft and sentimental.

The aim of democracy is to bring about radical economic and social changes in a peaceful, non-violent way. A revolution becomes necessary if there is a persistent tension between urgent demands for justice and stubborn resistance to them. Marxists are convinced that the owners of property will refuse to submit to the will of democracy, when it imposes drastic restraints on the rights of property. They argue that it is impossible to build a new economic order in a peaceful, democratic way. No social order will ever yield its place to its successor without resistance. History teaches us that social order can be changed only with violent seizure of power and class struggle. In a civilised democracy like the United States of America, slavery could not be abolished without a civil war. "Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one." Only class struggle and violent revolution can clear the road to socialism. But the Russian remedy did not succeed on account of its undemocratic character, its violence and impatience. The Russian government became a dictatorship relying on the use of force unrestricted by laws, customary rules or agreements. Violent revolutions are achieved in fits of rage. Class hatred as a great driving power can never be successful. Material force is no moral argument. We need not think that the poor have a monopoly of virtues, administrative capacity, directive ability and disinterested devotion, while the rich have a full share of all the conceivable vices, lack of imagination, selfishness, corruption.

Their attitudes are fundamentally similar. They both regard the problem of property as supreme. The only differences between communists and capitalists are with regard to the ownership of property, whether it is to be in private hands or under collective control. Their attitude with regard to the primacy of the economic is the same.

It is generally believed that the methods of democracy are slow and wasteful, cumbrous and out of date. Those engaged in transforming the inequitable society into a structure based on equality are afraid that it would take a very long time to effect the necessary changes through parliamentary procedure. So we have dictatorships of the right in the interests of reaction, and of the left in the interests of socialism.

Great spiritual issues are at stake today. Intellectually and morally our world walks on the edge of an abyss. If a democracy is educated, and has imaginative vision and moral courage, it can bring about a social revolution without violence. The democratic way of life is not a law of nature. It is not an evolutionary process destined to establish itself, wherever human beings value their manhood. It is a precious possession won by enlightened people after ages of struggle, and can be lost in a dark age, when men grow indifferent to it. It is an idea, not a system, and we must guard it with the utmost care, especially at a time when the speeding up of a mechanical civilisation is engendering mass subservience. Democratic methods of reform can cope with revolutionary situations. Any economic system which disregards the personality of the worker, or for the profit of the few exposes him to soul-destroying want or corrupting idleness, must be ended. There must be a proper distribution of the world's economic goods as economic means purchase opportunity. There must be great limitations on the accumulation of wealth, and the responsibility of each for all in the matter of property should be admitted. There is a difference between property accumulated by a change of hands in a stock market speculation, and the property which a farmer builds up by his toil. The latter has rights that do not belong to the former. When Lenin launched the "New Economic Policy" of 1921, he restored economic life through private enterprise. Income must be regarded as reward for service, not a sacred right arising from property.

The Soviet alliance with Britain and America in this war will

lead to a change, on democratic lines, in the form and content of communism. Contemporary communism is more sober and willing to defend democracy, in theory at least. In practice it is not successful, for the obvious reason that communist theory has no room for democracy. Communist criticism of democracy belongs to the period subsequent to the Russian Revolution. Marx himself accepted the validity of the democratic principle; the Marxist party was called the Social Democratic party, and aimed at bringing about the social revolution through the methods of democracy. By obtaining the democratic franchise, the workers obtain an essential part of sovereignty and acquire real political power, which they use for increasing the beneficent activities of the State. Successful efforts in this direction diminish the revolutionary urge. A non-capitalist democracy takes away political power from property as such, and vests it in the individual as such. "The first step in the workers' revolution," says the *Communist Manifesto*, "is the raising of the proletariat to the ruling class, the conquest of democracy." When the proletariat becomes the ruling class, revolution becomes a political irrelevance. Marx admits the possibility of a peaceful revolution. He writes: "Some day the workers must conquer political supremacy, in order to establish the new organisation of labour; they must overthrow the old political system whereby the old institutions are sustained . . . of course I must not be supposed to imply that the means to this end will be everywhere the same. We know that special regard must be paid to the institutions, customs and traditions of various lands, and we do not deny that there are certain countries, such as the United States and England, in which the workers may hope to secure their ends by peaceful means." We must exhaust the utmost possibilities of democratic action before we start on the revolutionary road. Communism need not be identified with a system of violence, irreligion, tyranny and individual suppression. It attacked religion, because religion in the person of its rulers was essentially cautious and conservative, tenacious of the old order and protective of the old rights. When the Marxists say that the State will "wither away," they mean that it will "wither away" in the sense of "an organisation of violence for the purpose of holding down some class."

If political democracy is to become an economic democracy, leading to the establishment of an ethical and spiritual democracy, we must recall men to the faith that is at the

source of vital democracy. We must educate men into the reality, the nature and the responsibility of human brotherhood. It is a new psychology that we have to develop. It is not a matter of theoretical learning. It is an education of the heart and the imagination, more than that of the intellect. It is education into a new spirit or ethos. The revolutionary conceives the problem in too simple terms. The evils of the world are regarded as external to the individual self. If evil is incarnate, it is incarnate in other people, a class or a race, a community or a nation. There is nothing to alter except machinery. But we must create the temper of mind to use the machinery. We must cultivate democracy as a state of mind, a style of life. A world brotherhood can be born only by the achievement of community within ourselves. Here is the task for religion.

Lecture III

HINDU DHARMA

Hindu Civilisation — Spiritual Values — The Concept of Dharma—The Sources of Dharma—Principles of Change—Religious Institutions—Caste and Untouchability—Sacraments.

Hindu Civilisation

WHILE other civilisations have perished, or have been absorbed in the changes that have transpired in the march of over five thousand years, the Indian civilisation, which is contemporary with those of Egypt and Babylon, is still functioning. We cannot say that it has run its course, or is about to complete a fatal destiny. In some aspects of its life, India may seem to be a land of dead values and decaying manners. But we have prophet souls, who are intent on the unmasking of this decay and the reaffirming of the simple truths. This shows her vitality. To those accustomed to the idea of progress, with its myriad changes that pursue each other in endless succession, the persistence of Indian culture is a phenomenon which calls for explanation. By what strange social alchemy has India subdued her conquerors, transforming them to her very self and substance? How has she managed to remain more or less the same in the midst of social migrations, upheavals and political changes that have elsewhere changed the face of society? Why is it that her conquerors have not been able to impose on her their language, their thoughts and customs, except in superficial ways? It is not by the use of force, or by the development of aggressive qualities, that India has succeeded in her mission. May not the fortunes of India and China be a manifestation of that common law of nature, by which the members of the sabre-toothed tiger species have been reduced while the unresisting sheep have been very largely preserved?

Hinduism is not based on any racial factor. Though the civilisation has its roots in the spiritual life of the Vedic Aryans, and has not lost the traces of its origin, it has taken so much from the social life of the Dravidian, and other native, inhabitants that it is difficult to disentangle, in modern Hinduism, the Vedic and

the non-Vedic elements. The interpenetration has been complex, subtle and continuous. The different communities which accepted Hinduism rose to the level of the society around them, educated themselves in its spirit, took on its colour and contributed to its growth. The epics of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* describe the spread of Hindu ideals, though in them the facts of history are obscured in a haze of legend. By the time this spread was made effective in large parts of India, the Vedic civilisation found itself in a world of altered values. Old institutions like yajña were disparaged, and a new onrush of devotional feeling pervaded the atmosphere. Hinduism is not limited in scope to the geographical area which is described as India. Its sway in early days spread to Campā, Cambodia, Jāva and Bāli. There is nothing which prevents it from extending to the uttermost parts of the earth. India is a tradition, a spirit, a light. Her physical and spiritual frontiers do not coincide.

Hinduism is an inheritance of thought and aspiration, living and moving with the movement of life itself, an inheritance to which every race in India has made its distinct and specific contribution. Its culture has a certain unity, though on examination it dissolves into a variety of shades and colours. The differences are not yet completely resolved, though, ever since the dawn of reflection, the dream of unity has hovered over the scene and haunted the imagination of the leaders. To improve the present condition of Indian society, to reshape its life in a fashion equal to the magnitude of the times, we must rediscover its soul, what we have in our blood by inheritance, those wordless ideals, the things that lie in the depths of our being as permanent potentialities. Our values do not change; but the ways and means of expressing them do. India puts spiritual values higher than others.

Spiritual Values

Spiritual experience starts with the assumption that this world as it is is unsatisfactory, and human nature as it is is unideal. But the destiny of man is not to escape from this imperfection, but to use it as an urge for improvement. The ignorance and the imperfection are not besetting sins which we have to overthrow, but the very conditions for the manifestation of spirit. Our limited consciousness

is to be used as an opening to a higher, infinite self-existence and beatitude. The limited and the unlimited, the imperfect and the perfect, are not perpetual opposites. Even the *Advaita Vedānta* asserts not only that there is opposition between truth and illusion, but also that the divine is here, in everything, that all this is that. The knower of Brahman moves and acts in this world, and yet lives in peace and freedom. We need not look to another world for the beauty and perfection that this world suggests. The world is the seat of spiritual liberation.[1] The cosmic process is no mere repetition of the same phenomena, but an onward march, a steady ascent, from an original inconscience to more and more developed consciousness. There are spiritual possibilities ahead of us, which we have not reached. The *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, which speaks of this progression, does not stop with the imperfect mental being called man. Vijñāna, or human intelligence, is not the final stage of spiritual evolution. There is a far greater consciousness characterised by infinite self-existence, pure awareness and freedom of delight, ānanda, which releases not partially and imperfectly, but wholly and absolutely, the indwelling divine. This evolutionary ascent from the world of inanimate matter (anna) through life (prāṇa), mind (manas) and intelligence (vijñāna) to self-existent awareness and delight (ānanda) is happening, not automatically or capriciously, but under the stress of the divine. The spiritual progression to a far greater consciousness than the human mind is itself a manifestation of divine activity. Life in the world is not a distraction from, but a means to the attainment of the final end. Human life is not to be regarded as unworthy.[2] Human desires are the means by which the ideal becomes actual. The world is not a mistake or an illusion to be cast aside by the soul, but a scene of spiritual evolution by which, out of the material, the divine consciousness may be manifested. Śaṁkara looks upon spiritual experience (avagati) as the end of the entire cosmic process.[3] Earth is only heaven in the making. Contingent existence can be raised to unconditioned significance. "Eternity is in love with the productions of time." "God possesses the heavens, but he covets the earth."

[1] mokṣāyate saṁsāraḥ.

[2] upabhogair api tyaktaṁ nātmānaṁ sādayen naraḥ
caṇḍālatvepi mānuṣyaṁ sarvathā tāta śobhanam.

[3] Commenting on the *Bhagavadgītā*, ix. 10, he writes: "jagatah sarvā pravṛttih . . . avagatiniṣṭhā, avagaty avasānaiva."

Why should there be this cleavage from the ultimate, this isolation and this transaction through toil and suffering to the atonement? Why should the ego set up for itself its own self-affirmation, in preference to its unity with the divine? Why should there be all this suffering and ignorance, this groping and struggle? Why should there be this movement from imperfection to perfection? Is it the arbitrary will of a capricious divine? We do not say that the divine is beyond the World: it is also behind it. It is supporting this world with its oneness, and sustaining us all in facing the burden of division. The cosmos is working out a great possibility of reaching spiritual oneness through the exercise of human freedom, with all its consequences of danger and difficulty, pain and imperfection. Why is all this difficult ascent from crude beginnings? What has brought about this isolation from the eternal, this division from the permanent? As to why the divine should have permitted this particular plan, we can understand it when we cross the barrier of our limited intelligence, and see things from the Supreme Identity that lies behind the terrestrial process. From where we are, we can only say that it is a mystery (māyā), or is the divine will, or the expression of his creative force. Māyā does not mean that the world is a vain illusion, mere smoke without fire. The purpose of human life is to cross the line, to emerge from insufficiency and ignorance to fullness and wisdom. This is mokṣa, or liberation into the light of superconsciousness. It is parama puruṣārtha, the supreme end of life, and the means to it is dharma. Mokṣa or liberation is to be achieved here and now, on earth, through human relations. If spiritual ideas are to conquer, they can do so only by getting embodied in institutions. The solemn rites which hallow the achievement of adolescence, the blessings of marriage, care for the dead, are essentially acts of worship. Everything in the visible world can become a revelation of invisible reality. All acts we perform are sanctified by reference to the godward life.

The Concept of Dharma

The principles which we have to observe in our daily life and social relations are constituted by what is called dharma. It is truth's embodiment in life, and power to refashion our nature.

In the history of life, the human brain is a novel production.

It brings with it a distinctive mode of adaptation to circumstances. Through it the human being is enabled to learn from experience and store the lessons in memory. The difference between human history and natural history is that the former can never begin again. Lower species survive or pass out, by their inherited outfit. They can learn but little. Köhler and others have shown that the chimpanzee and the orang-utan are distinguished from man not by what is known as intelligence, but by their memory. Animals suffer from an oblivion of what they lived through, and work with very little experience. The tiger of today is identical with that of 6000 years ago. Each one begins his life as a tiger from the beginning as if none had ever existed before him. But man remembers his past and uses it in the present. Nietzsche says that man is the being with the longest memory. That is his single treasure, his mark, and his privilege. In his life instinctive responses are supplemented by acquired habits. A mental superstructure is imposed on natural dispositions. Man is a teachable animal, socially controlled. The fashions of our clothes, the food we eat, the way we go about the world, are all social products which we acquire by training. Instincts are the plastic raw material, and our culture supplies the design and the method. We are creatures of habit more than of reason or of instinct. Our conduct is the outcome not of native impulses of human nature, but of artificial psychic causes. The power of custom to control and limit our action is universal. Its capacity to blind us is incredible. We are astonished at the injustices and cruelties that we authorise or acquiesce in. We can be made to do anything, if we are given powerful suggestions and moral clothings which will create in us an attitude of consent. Slavery, infanticide, the inquisition, witch-burning, were all accepted as honourable to human dignity, even as wars are today.

Under the concept of dharma, the Hindu brings the forms and activities which shape and sustain human life. We have diverse interests, various desires, conflicting needs, which grow and change in the growing. To round them off into a whole is the purpose of dharma. The principle of dharma rouses us to a recognition of spiritual realities not by abstention from the world, but by bringing to its life, its business (artha) and its pleasures (kāma), the controlling power of spiritual faith. Life is one, and in it there is no distinction of sacred and secular. Bhakti and Mukti are not

opposed.[1] Dharma, artha and kāma go together.[2] The ordinary avocations of daily life are in a real sense service of the Supreme. The common tasks are as effective as monastic devotion. The Hindu does not elevate asceticism, or exalt the sterile renunciation of the joys of life. Physical well-being is an essential part of human well-being.[3] Pleasure is a part of the good life. It is both sensuous and spiritual. To enjoy the sunshine, to listen to music, to read a play, are both sensuous and spiritual. Pleasure as such is not to be condemned.

Similarly the economic factor is an essential element in human life. There is no sin in wealth, just as there is no virtue in poverty. The efforts of anyone to increase his wealth cannot be condemned, but if the pursuit of wealth means loss to others, monetary or moral, then the question arises whether the acquisition of wealth by such methods and with such results is right. The Hindu code insists on the motive of social service, not personal gain. The different values of life must be pursued equally, not one at the expense of the other.[4] Bhavabhūti tells us that "knowledge of philosophy is prized for the ascertainment of truth; wealth is desired only for the help it affords in the discharge of social, economic and religious duties and obligations; and married life is welcomed because it is the means of raising a worthy progeny."[5] Kālidāsa in *Raghuvaṁśa* says: "who acquired wealth for giving away, who spoke sparingly in order to preserve faith, who were desirous of conquest for fame, and who entered upon married life for progeny."[6] We are required to make every particle of dust into sweet honey.[7] The development of the country in art and culture, in commerce and industry, was

[1] Cp. *Mahāparinirvāṇa Tantra:*
śrutaṁ bahuvidhaṁ dharmam ihāmutra sukhapradam
dharmārthakāmadaṁ vighnaharaṁ nirvāṇakāraṇam.

[2] To the question:
dharmaś cārthas ca kāmaśca parasparavirodhinah / eṣāṁ nityaviruddhānāṁ katham ekatra samgamaḥ
the answer is given:
yada dharmaś ca bhāryā ca parasparavaśānugau / tadā dharmārtha kāmānāṁ trayāṇām api saṁgamah.

[3] śarīraṁ dharmasarvasvaṁ rakṣaṇīyaṁ prayatnatah.

[4] dharmārthakāmaḥ samam eva sevyaḥ
yo hi ekasaktaḥ sa jano jaghanyaḥ.

[5] te śrotriyās tattvaviniścayāya bhūriśrutaṁ śāsvatam ādriyante
iṣṭāya pūrtāya ca karmane'rthān dārā'napatyāya taportham āyuh.
Mālatīmādhava, I. 5.

[6] tyāgāya sambhrtārthānāṁ satyāya mitabhāṣiṇām
yaśase vijigīṣūnāṁ prajāyai grihamedhinām.—I. 7.

[7] madhumat pārthivaṁ rajaḥ.

great. The qualities of the steel used in the Aśoka pillar at Delhi are still a matter of wonder to the steel industries of the world. Wealth and enjoyment are not opposed to righteousness and perfection. If pursued for their own sake they are not right; but if adopted as means to spiritual well-being and social good, they are worthy of acceptance.

Dharma is a word of protean significance. It is derived from the root dhṛ (to uphold, to sustain, to nourish).[1] It is the norm which sustains the universe, the principle of a thing in virtue of which it is what it is. In the Vedas, it is used to denote religious rites. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* speaks of the three branches of the dharma, relating to the duties of the householder, the hermit and the student.[2] When the *Tattirīya Upaniṣad* asks us to practise dharma,[3] it refers to the duties of the stage of life to which we belong. In this sense it is employed by the *Bhagavadgītā* and Manu. It is, for the Buddhist, one of the three jewels (triratna), along with the Buddha and the sangha or the community. According to the *Pūrva Mīmāmsā*, it is a desirable object defined by a direction.[4] The *Vaiśeṣika Sūtra* defines dharma as that from which happiness and beatitude result.[5] For our purposes, we may define dharma as the whole duty of man in relation to the fourfold purposes of life (dharma, artha, kāma and mokṣa) by members of the four groups (cāturvarṇa) and the four stages (caturāśrama). While the supreme aim of social order is to train human beings for a state of spiritual perfection and sanctity, its essential aim is directed, by reason of its temporal ends, towards such a development of social conditions as will lead the mass of people to a level of moral, material and intellectual life in accord with the good and peace of all, as these conditions assist each person in the progressive realisation of his life and liberty.

The basic principle of dharma is the realisation of the dignity of the human spirit, which is the dwelling-place of the Supreme. "The knowledge that the Supreme Spirit dwells in the heart of every living creature is the abiding root principle of all dharma."[6] "Know this to be the essence of dharma and then practise it;

[1] Cp. dhāraṇād dharmam ity āhur dharmeṇa vidhṛtāḥ prajāḥ.
[2] trayo dharma skandhā.—II. 23.
[3] dharmaṁ cara.—I. 11.
[4] codanālakṣanārtho' dharmaḥ.
[5] yato abhyudayaniḥśreyasasiddhiḥ, sa dharmaḥ.
[6] bhagavān vāsudevo hi sarvabhūteṣu avasthitaḥ
etad jñānaṁ hi sarvasya mūlaṁ dharmasya śāśvatam.

refrain from doing unto others what you will not have done unto yourself."[1] "We should not do to others what will be offensive to us. This is dharma in essence; other behaviour is due to selfish desire."[2] We must look upon others as ourselves. "He who, by his action, mind and speech is continually engrossed in the welfare of others and who is always a friend of others, O Jājali, knows the meaning of dharma."[3] The virtues incumbent on all are non-hatred to all beings in thought, word and deed, good will and charity.[4] Freedom is through discipline.[5] In other words, our social life must be so directed as to recognise effectively the right of each of its members to live, work and grow in his life as a person. It is consecrated activity. The core of the individual's life takes him beyond the social forms, though he has need of them. The social life is a movement in our destiny, not the terminus. Its state is always one of tension and movement. There is a perpetual endeavour to raise as high as possible the general level of existence in relation to the given conditions. The Hindu dharma gives us a programme of rules and regulations and permits their constant change. The rules of dharma are the mortal flesh of immortal ideas, and so are mutable.

The Sources of Dharma

The sources of dharma are: (i) the Śruti or the Vedas, (ii) the tradition and practice of those that know it, (iii) the conduct of virtuous men, and (iv) individual conscience.[6]

[1] śrūyatām dharmasarvasvam śrutvā cāpi avadhāryatām
ātmanaḥ pratikūlāni pareśāṁ na samācaret. Devala.
Cp. *Āpastamba*: ātmavat sarvabhūtāni yaḥ paśyati sa paśyati.

[2] na tat parasya samdadhyāt pratikūlaṁ yad ātmanah
eṣa sāmāsiko dharmaḥ kāmād anyaḥ pravartate.

[3] sarveṣāṁ yaḥ suhrin nityaṁ sarveṣāṁ ca hite rataḥ
karmaṇā manasā vācā sa dharmaṁ veda jājale.—*Śāntiparva*, 261. 9.
Cp. also:
sarvaśāstramayī gītā sarvadevamayo hariḥ / sarvatīrthamayī gaṅgā sarvadharmamayī dayā.—*Gītāsāra*.

[4] adrohaḥ sarvabhūteṣu karmanā manasā girā
anugrahas ca dānaṁ ca satāṁ dharmah sanātanaḥ.—*M.B. Śāntiparva*, 162. 21.

[5] vedasyopaniṣad satyaṁ satyasyopaniṣad damaḥ
damasyopaniṣan mokṣah etat sarvānuśāsanam.
Cp. also:
nāhaṁ śaptah pratiśapāmi kiñcid damaṁ dvāraṁ hy amṛtasyeha vedmi
guhyaṁ brahma tad idaṁ bravīmi na mānuṣāt śreṣṭhataraṁ hi kiñcit.

[6] vedokhilo dharmamūlaṁ smṛtiśīleca tad vidām
ācāraścaiva sādhūnām, ātmanas tuṣṭir eva ca.—*Manu*, II. 6.
See *Gautama Dharma Sūtra*, I. 1-2.

The Veda is the basis of the Hindu religion.[1] Its words are simple, significant and ancient, full of faith and devotion, confidence and certitude. In them are concentrated the eternal hope and consolation of man. It is difficult to conceive the earnestness of the sages from whose lips first issued the great prayer: "Out of unreality lead me to reality; out of darkness lead me to light; out of death lead me to life eternal." [2] The Vedic utterances are endless in their suggestiveness.[3] The Śruti includes both Vedas and Tantras according to Hārīta.[4] For men of some sects included in Hinduism, the Vedas are not the source of authority. Medhātithi says: "Thus all the alien sects, like the Bhojakas, Pañcarātrikas, Nirgranthas, Anarthavādas, Pāśupatas and others, hold that the great men and the particular deities, who are the authors of their creeds, directly perceived the truths underlying them, and think that dharma did not originate from the Vedas." [5]

The Vedas do not contain a systematic account of dharma. They indicate the ideals and mention certain practices. Rules and commands, as distinct from instances of conduct, are found in the smṛtis and the dharmaśāstras, which are practically synonymous. Smṛtis literally refer to what is remembered by the sages, who are well versed in the learning of the Vedas. Any rule in a smṛti for which a Vedic source can be found becomes invested with the authority of the Veda. If Śruti and Smṛti conflict, the former is to be accepted.[6]

The way in which the disciplined (śiṣṭa) behave is also a source of dharma.[7] The practice of good men is expected to be in accordance with the scriptural injunctions, and is therefore regarded as a guide to conduct. Good men need not necessarily be Brāhmins.

[1] śrutipramāṇako dharmaḥ.—*Hārīta.*

[2] asato mā sad gamaya, tamaso mā jyotir gamaya, mṛtyor mā amṛtam gamaya.

[3] anantā vai vedāḥ.

[4] śrutis ca dvividhā, vaidikī tāntrikī ca. Quoted by Kullūka on *Manu*, II. 1.

[5] na vedamūlam api dharmam abhimanyante.—On *Manu*, II. 6.

[6] *Śāstradīpika*, I. 3. 4. Kumārila writes: "Inasmuch as these smṛtis have emanated from human authors, and are not eternal like the Veda, their authority cannot be self-sufficient. The smṛtis of Manu and others are dependent upon the memory of their authors, and memory depends for its authority on the truthfulness of its source; consequently the authority of not a single smṛti can be held to be self-sufficient like that of the Veda; and yet, inasmuch as we find them accepted as authoritative by an unbroken line of respectable persons learned in the Veda, we cannot reject them as absolutely untrustworthy. Hence it is that there arises a feeling of uncertainty regarding their trustworthy character."—*Tantravārttika.*

[7] *Mahābhārata* has an oft-quoted verse: tarko apratiṣṭhaḥ śrutayo vibhinnā, naiko munir yasya mataṁ pramāṇam / dharmasya tattvaṁ nihitaṁ guhāyāṁ mahājano yena gataḥ sa panthāḥ.

Mitra Miśra accepts as authority the practice of the good śūdras (sacchūdra). They must be, according to Vaśiṣṭha, selfless.[1] Local custom was also accepted as authoritative,[2] and was included in sadācāra. Yājñavalkya says that "one should not practise that which, though ordained by the smṛti, is condemned by the people." [3] Bṛhaspati declared that "the time-honoured institutions of each country, caste and family should be preserved intact." [4] If, in some tribes, polyandry was current, Hindu rulers did not interfere with it. Speaking of a newly conquered country, Yājñavalkya says: "whatever the custom, law and usages, those should be observed and followed by the King as before." [5] But the custom should not be immoral or opposed to public interests. It must be sadācāra. Gautama observes that rules of conduct for countries, races and families are authoritative if they are not opposed to the Śruti.[6] Whatever the society assimilates, it harmonises with its dominant pattern of thought and action.

Along with the practice of the elect, we have "good conscience" recognised as a source of dharma.[7] Yājñavalkya mentions what is agreeable to oneself, and desire born of careful thought.[8] It is the conscience of the disciplined, not the caprice of the shallow. Whatever is sanctioned by the heart [9] or praised by the Aryans [10] is dharma. Manu asks us to do that which will give satisfaction to the inner self (antarātman).[11] Whatever is based on sound reasoning ought to be accepted, even if it proceed from a boy or a parrot. Whatever is not so based ought to be rejected, even if it is uttered by an old man or the sage Śuka himself.[12]

There were exceptions to the rules of duty permitted in times of distress. Necessity knows no law, and any form of conduct essential for self-preservation is allowed under the rules of *āpaddharma*. Viśvāmitra found that it was necessary for him to steal dog's flesh for preserving his life, and he justified it by saying that keeping alive

[1] akāmātmā.—I. 6.
[2] *Āśvalāyana*, I. 7. 1; *Baudhāyana*, I. 5. (3).
[3] I. 156.
[4] II. 29-31. Cp. deśadharmān jātidharmān
kuladharmāmśca śāśvatām
pāṣaṇḍagana dharmāmśca
śāstresmin uktavān manuḥ.—*Manu*, I. 118.
[5] I. 342-3.
[6] deśajātikuladharmāś' cāmnāyair aviruddhāh pramāṇam.
[7] ātmanastuṣṭiḥ.—*Manu*, II. 6.
[8] svasya ca priyam ātmanah samyak samkalpajaḥ kāmo, II. 12. *Yājñavalkya*, I. 7.
[9] hṛdayenabhyanujñātaḥ.—*Manu*, II. 1.
[10] yam āryaḥ praśamsanti.—*Viśvāmitra*.
[11] IV. 161.
[12] yuktiyuktaṁ vaco grāhyaṁ bālād api śukād api
yukti hīnam, vacas tyājyaṁ vṛddhād api śukād api.

is better than dying. One must live before one can live according to dharma.[1] Śruti is the highest authority; next in importance is Smṛti, or the tradition set up by human beings; and it is authoritative in so far as it is not repugnant to the Veda from which it derives its authority. Practices or customs (ācāra) are trustworthy if they are adopted by the cultured. Individual conscience is also authoritative.

The Vedas could not have anticipated all our needs, and we have to trust to the wisdom of the wise who are familiar with the spirit of the Vedas. They have not provided for every conceivable case, but have laid down certain general principles which we may extend to new cases with discrimination and judgment. The decisions of the pariṣads, or assemblies of the learned, can be accepted when we are convinced that they are unbiased. Cases of doubt and dispute are to be decided by them. In *Manu* and *Parāśara* it is laid down that a pariṣad should be formed when vital changes are introduced in the habits of the people. A pariṣad should generally have a hundred wise Brāhmins, but in times of crisis, even a single individual of insight and self-control can function as a pariṣad.[2] *Smṛti cañdrikā* holds that a convention made by the virtuous is as good as the authority of the Veda.[3] Manu lays down that if committees cannot be constituted, even the opinion of one excellent Brāhmin will suffice.[4] Only those who are disciplined, compassionate to all living beings, learned in the Vedas and methods of logical inference, practical-minded (deśakālavibhāgajñaḥ) and of stainless character, have the power to legislate for the community. These form the conscious mind and conscience of the nation. Social standards do not spring spontaneously into existence by a natural process of social evolution. They are the result of the spiritual effort of individual souls, who are creative geniuses. Though they are always in a minority, they act on men of common clay, not by the method of direct illumination, but by a kind of social drill. Ordinary

[1] jīvitaṁ maraṇāt śreyo jīvan dharmam avāpnuyāt.

[2] munīnām ātmavidyānāṁ dvijānāṁ yajñayājināṁ
vedavrateṣu snātānām eko'pi pariṣad bhavet.—*Parāśara*, VIII. 3.

When Ma'ad was appointed ruler of Yemen, the Prophet is reported to have asked him as to how he would decide matters coming up before him. "I will judge matters according to the Book of God," said Ma'ad. "But if the Book of God contains nothing to guide you?" "Then I will act on the precedents of the Prophet of God." "But if the precedents fail?" "Then I will exert to form my own judgment."—Iqbal, *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* (1934), p. 141.

[3] samayaś cāpi sādhūnāṁ pramāṇaṁ vedavad bhaved.

[4] dharmajñaḥ samayaḥ pramāṇam.

people perform mechanically an evolution which they could not have effected on their own initiative.

We have to decide the right course of action in each context. Āpastamba says: "Dharma and adharma do not go about saying: 'Here we are'; nor do the gods nor the gandharvas nor the ancestors declare: 'this is right,' 'this is wrong.'"[1] We have to apply our reason and interpret the tradition. We should not blindly follow the texts without realising their relevance.[2] Whatever the noble praise is right; whatever they censure is wrong.[3] This is in conformity with the Śruti injunction that, when doubts arise as to what is permissible or not, the view of the pious should prevail. *Mītākṣara* says: "Practise not what is abhorred by the world even if permitted by dharma, for it does not secure celestial bliss."[4] Where it is difficult to ascertain what the right course of action is, he who performs his ordained duty is free from sin. When once the right is determined we must conform to it. Vyāsa exhorts us to conform to dharma, even if it involves the frustration of all worldly desires, leads to frightful consequences and poverty, and threatens the destruction of one's own life.[5] Bhaṛtṛhari says: "The righteous soul will not deviate from the right path, whether the worldly-wise praise or censure them, whether they lose or gain wealth, whether it involves immediate destruction or long life."[6]

The laws of dharma, whose breaches entail judicial proceedings, are called vyavahāra, or law proper. Hindu lawyers distinguish moral precepts from legal rules, the rules relating to religious and moral observances (ācāra) and expiation (prāyaścitta) from those relating to positive law (vyavahāra). *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* has three chapters: ācāra, vyavahāra and prāyaścitta. Vyavahāra or civil law relates to marriage, adoption, partition, inheritance. It is based on previously existing usages. Bṛhaspati maintains that there

[1] na dharmādharmau carata 'avāṁ sva iti; na devagandharvā na piṭarah ācakṣate ayaṁ dharmo, ayam adharma iti.—I. 20. 6.

[2] Cp. *Bṛhaspati*: kevalaṁ śāstramāśritya na kartavyo vinirṇayaḥ / yuktihīnevicāre tu dharmahāniḥ prajāyate. See *Rājadharma*, by K. V. Rangaswamy Ayyangar (1941), p. 114. ārśaṁ dharmopadeśam ca vedaśāstrāvirodhinā / yas tarkeṇanusamdhatte sa dharmaṁ veda netaraḥ.—*Manu*, XII. 106.

[3] yam āryah kriyamāṇaṁ praśamsanti sa dharmaḥ, yaṁ garhante so' dharmaḥ.

[4] I. iii. 4.

[5] na jātu kāmān na bhayān na lobhād,
dharmaṁ tyajed jīvitasyāpi hetoḥ.
nindantu nītinipuṇā yadi va stuvantu
lakṣmīh samāviśatu gacchatu va yathecchayā,
adyaiva vā maraṇam astu yugāntare vā
nyāyyāt pathah pravicalamti padaṁ na dhīrāh.

are four kinds of laws to be administered by the rulers, and decisions in doubtful cases are to be made by reference to them: dharma or moral law, vyavahāra or civil law, caritra or custom, and rajaśāsana or Kings' Ordinances.[1] Legislative enactments based on equity and common sense are authoritative, and supersede previous law and custom. We can abrogate or modify rules of Hindu law by means of enactments of the legislature. The Caste Disabilities Removal Act (XXI of 1850), the Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act (XV of 1856), the Special Marriage Act (III of 1872), with its amendment in 1923, which provides for civil marriage subject to the provisions of the Indian Divorce Act, the Arya Marriage Validation Act (XIX of 1937), Hindu Women's Rights to Property Act (XVIII of 1937), which confers on the widow rights of inheritance to the dead husband's property even when he has male issue, have the binding force of dharma or law. In the seventies of last century Mr. Mayne, whose treatise on *Hindu Law and Usage* has become a classic on the subject, wrote that Hindu law was in a state of arrested progress, in which no voices were heard unless they came from the tomb. His statement remains substantially true, in spite of a few changes effected by legislation and case law. While we take note of the just principles of Hindu jurisprudence, their application to modern conditions requires legislative reforms. It has to be undertaken in a systematic, not piecemeal, fashion.

Principles of Change

A living society must have both the power of continuity and the power of change. In a savage community there is hardly any progress from one generation to another. Change is looked upon with suspicion and all human energies are concentrated on maintaining the *status quo*. In a civilised community progress and change are the life-blood of its activity. Nothing is so subversive to society as a blind adherence to outworn forms and obsolete habits which survive by mere inertia. The Hindu view makes room for essential changes. There must be no violent break with social heredity, and yet the new stresses, conflicts and confusions will have to be faced and overcome. While the truths of spirit are permanent, the rules change from age to age.[2] Our cherished institutions pass away. They have

[1] II. 18. [2] *Parāśara,* I. 33. yugarūpānusārataḥ. I. 22. See *Manu,* I. 85.

their day and cease to be. They are products of time and are superseded by time. But we cannot identify dharma with any specific set of institutions. It endures because it has its roots in human nature, and it will outlive any of its historical embodiments. The method of dharma is that of experimental change. All institutions are experiments, even as all life is. Legislators are hampered by their environment, even when they are attempting to transcend it. There is nothing sacred and immaculate about law and institutions. *Parāśara Smṛti* declares that in the four ages of Kṛta, Treta, Dvāpara and Kali, the ordinances of Manu, Gautama, Śankhalikhita and Parāśara are respectively of the highest authority. We cannot transfer the beliefs and usages of one age to another. Moral ideas about social relationships are not absolute, but relative to the needs and conditions of different types of society. Though dharma is absolute, it has no absolute and timeless content. The only thing eternal about morality is man's desire for the better. But time and circumstances determine what the 'better' is in each situation. We cannot elevate social conventions into absolute rules, without taking into account the concrete attendant circumstances. There is no positive human action that can be pronounced *a priori* to be absolutely right or wrong, wholly without regard to the circumstances in which it is done. Forms of conduct are regarded as good or bad at different stages of civilisation, according as they further or hamper human happiness. The Hindu legislators were neither visionaries nor realists. They had ideals, but not impracticable ones. They recognised that society is a slow growth. Things die and must be cleared out of the road. Institutions and dogmas which lose the stuff of life must be scrapped. The undying timeless truths manifest themselves in ever-returning newness of life. Vijñāneśvara, though a conservative jurist, urged that society has the right to reject unsuitable laws, even if they are permitted by the scriptures. He cites the illustration of the sacrifice of cows and the eating of beef which were once held valid, though rejected in his time as wrong. Similarly the practice of niyoga was perfectly legal in the past, though now held illegal. Laws were made and unmade as the times required. Those who are familiar with the work of the commentators on Hindu law works know the magnitude of the changes effected by them. The rulers who administered the law with the assistance of paṇdits anticipated the needs of society and made changes. Ethics and law reflect the ideas and interests of particular

phases of social evolution and become highly resistant to change as they acquire a peculiar sanctity by association with religion. Social flexibility has been the chief character of Hindu dharma. To uphold the sanātana dharma is not to stand still. It is to seize the vital principles and use them in modern life. All true growth preserves unity through change. When the seed becomes the plant, when the germ becomes the full-grown baby, there is uninterrupted continuity. While changes occur they are not felt as such, because there is the unifying force also, combining the new material and controlling it. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* the father illustrates the active character of the Real by the example of the nyagrodha tree. "Fetch me thence a fruit of the Nyagrodha tree." "Here is one, sir." "Break it." "It is broken, sir." "What do you see there?" "Nothing, sir." The father said: "My son, that subtle essence which you do not perceive there, of that very essence this great nyagrodha tree exists."[1] The essence of the tree is in that invisible but active force without which the tree will wither and die. If the tree of dharma is to be preserved, we must let this invisible force order and sustain life's increasing manifestations. If our social order is not to go to pieces, if our social thought is not to become incoherent, we must control and give meaning to the outward experiences which are increasingly pouring on us. The principles of dharma, the scales of value, are to be maintained in and through the stress of the new experiences. Only then will it be possible for us to have balanced or integral social progress. If we try to adopt inherited codes in changing conditions, instability, if not collapse, will be the result. We should introduce changes today, and make the content of Hindu dharma relevant to modern conditions. The permeation of new forces in our society, the industrialisation of a mainly agricultural country, the separation of privilege and merit, the entry of non-Hindus into Hindu society and mixture of races by marriage or conversion, the emancipation of women, are some of the questions which require to be considered in a liberal spirit. In the Vedic age the Āryan Hindu was called upon to give social recognition to the non-Āryan Indians, the Draviḍians, the Āndhras and the Pulindas. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*[2] mentions that the Āndhras were the sons of Viśvāmitra. He apparently declared that the Āndhras were the equals of Āryans. In the Purāṇas, it is said that Viśvāmitra made a new creation. From the

[1] VI. 10 ff. [2] VII. 18.

Vedas we learn that the Vrātyas could be taken over into the Āryan fold, after the performance of the Vrātyastoma ceremony.[1] Provision is made for their purification, even after twelve generations. We do not know who the Vrātyas were.[2] Whether they were a separate community, or merely the members of the upper classes who failed to perform their ordained duties, is a matter for speculation. The popular view equates them with the Greeks (Yāvanas) and the barbarians (Mlecchas). The Greeks and the Scythians embraced Hinduism and showed the zeal of converts. Heliodorus, the Greek envoy, became a devotee of Viṣṇu (bhāgavata) and erected a column (garuda dhvaja) in a Vaiṣṇava temple.[3] The Hūnas became worshippers of Viṣṇu. Many foreign invaders settled down as Kṣatriyas. When, due to Muslim conquest, forcible conversions of masses of Hindu men and women took place, *Devala Smṛti*, composed some time after the eighth century A.D. in Sind, justified their reconversion.[4] Those who were taken prisoners of war, or were converted to another religion or mixed with the women of the new faith, could be taken back after purificatory rites according to Vaśiṣṭha, Atri and Parāśara. On the question of the readmissibility of women who had conceived during abduction, Devala holds that they should be taken back after the birth of the child, which was to be separated from the mother to avoid confusion of castes (varnasankara). Rūpa Gosvāmi and Sanātana Gosvāmi were Muslims who became disciples of Caitanya, and they wrote important works on the Caitanya cult of Vaiṣṇavism. Śivāji is said to have converted his general, who was forcibly taken into Islam and lived in Afghanistan with a Mussulman wife for ten years. In a recent case in the Madras High Court, it was decided that a convert from Christianity to Hinduism is to be accepted as a Hindu, if his caste regards him as such, even if there is no formal ceremony of reconversion.[5]

[1] *Kātyāyana*, XXII. 4. 1-28.

[2] Śaṁkara says: "prathamajatvat anyasya samskartur abhāvät asamskrataḥ vrātyaḥ; tvaṁ svabhāvataḥ eva śūdraḥ iti abhiprāyaḥ."

[3] The inscription reads: "This garuda column of Vāsudeva, the god of gods, was erected here by Heliodorus, a worshipper of Viṣṇu, the son of Dion, and an inhabitant of Takṣasila, who came as Greek ambassador from the great king Antialcidus to King Kāśīputra, Bhāgabhadra, the saviour, then reigning prosperously in the fourteenth year of his kingship."

[4] sindhūtīre sukhāsīnaṁ devalaṁ munisattamam
sametya munayah sarve idaṁ vacanam abruvan
bhagavan mlecchanītāhi kathaṁ śuddhim avāpnuyuh.

[5] Mr. Justice Krishnaswamy Aiyangar observed that in matters affecting the well-being and composition of a caste, the caste itself was the supreme judge, and if the caste

To meet new conditions, new smṛtis arose, and there is nothing either in the Vedas or in past usage which requires us to adhere to old forms which have become outworn. Medhātithi says: "Even at the present day, if there were a person possessed of the said qualifications, then for later generations it would be accepted just as authoritatively as the words of Manu and others." [1] Those who have the inner apprehension of the truth will be able to handle new experiences, and renew the sustaining power of dharma. If they sanction change, the sense of security is not shaken. Reform then proceeds without reaction. Smṛtis produced in the future, so long as they are based on fundamental truths of spirit set forth in the Vedas, will be quite authoritative. To quote Kālidāsa, nothing is good simply because it is ancient, and no composition is faulty merely because it is new.[2]

In this fateful hour, when our society has become a pathless jungle, we must listen to fresh notes as to ancestral voices. No custom could be useful to all people at all times.[3] If we are wedded overmuch to the rules of the past, if the living faith of the dead becomes the dead faith of the living, the civilisation will die. We must make rational changes.[4] If an organism loses the strength to excrete its own waste, it perishes. Freedom belongs only to the living. The spirit of freedom does not deny the past, but fulfils its promises. It preserves all that is best, and transforms it with a renewed vitality. If old practices are taken as final, they become fetters to the living spirit. The price of social freedom is not only eternal vigilance, but also perpetual renewal, eternal initiative, the ceaseless activity of the creative spirit. Life is not life unless it is thrusting continually into new forms. If we rest content with what our fathers have done, decay will set in. If we shirk the difficult task of improving the tradition of our culture by inertia and laziness, which the mediaeval Christian included among the mortal sins, our civilisation will suffer. For some time past there have been ominous signs of an almost general fatigue of the spirit, varying in degree in

had thought fit to give up old notions and practices and adopted new ones, not in any way repugnant to morality, such new usages should be respected. See *Indian Social Reformer*, 19th August 1939.

[1] *Medhātithi* on *Manu*, II. 6.

[2] purāṇam ity eva na sādhu sarvam
na cāpi kāvyaṁ navam ity avadyam.

[3] na hi sarvahitah kaścid ācārah sampravartate.—*Śāntiparva*, 259. 17.

[4] Cp. *Mahābhārata*:
tasmāt kaunteya viduṣā dharmādharmaviniścaye
buddhim āsthāya lokesmin vartitavyaṁ kṛtātmanā.

different parts. Even those who assert the dignity of reason act according to the dictates of custom. We cannot restore the practices of the Vedic period, for that would be to deny the dialectic of history. Again, we cannot start *de novo*, as if India had no history and as if people could change their nature merely by taking thought. Possibilities must be grounded in the nature of the actual. Civilisations must live on the lines of their own experience. Like individuals, even nations cannot borrow experience from others. They may furnish us with light, but our own history provides us with the conditions of action. The only revolutions that endure are those that are rooted in the past. We can make our own history, but we cannot do so at will, in conditions of our own choosing. The conditions are given to us. Even a culture that seems to be dead may leap into life, if there are two or three great members who inaugurate a new living tradition. Culture is tradition and tradition is memory. The duration of this memory depends on the continuous appearance of creative personalities. A culture dies a natural death when it becomes crystallised or congealed, an accidental or artificial death when its tradition is interrupted.

In the history of every community a time comes when radical changes in the social order are obligatory, if the community is to exist as a living force, and continue to progress. If it is unable to make the effort, if its strength is spent and its virility exhausted, it will pass out of the stage of history. A great opportunity for social change is at hand for us. We must purge society of man-made inequalities and injustices and provide, for all, equality of opportunity for personal well-being and development. Today we will be acting in the spirit of the Hindu tradition if those well-versed in our culture (bahuśrutāḥ), and keen on preserving its spirit, bring about radical changes in our social organisation. In India we cannot wipe the slate clean, and write a new gospel on a virgin surface. True progress is an organic thing like the growth of a tree. We must cut out the dead wood and cast away the withered past. We have changed so often in the past that a mere change does not disturb the spirit of the religion. Some of our institutions have become formidable obstacles to social justice and economic well-being, and we must strive to remove these obstacles, fight the forces which maintain superstition, and transform the mind of the people. In these years when the tempo of life is quickened, when knowledge grows and ambitions expand, we must effect changes, otherwise

it means that we have come to a dead end and lost the spirit of creation.

The mutts have outlived their function. They have ceased to learn and to teach, to inspire and to illumine. Initiative and improvement appear to have deserted them. At best they would pretend to an innocent and meditative repose. If their wealth had been applied to education, spiritual and secular, the general intellectual and moral tone of the country would have been raised. They do not realise that the tradition outlives the institutions that embody them.

The great regenerators of Hindu life have often been in opposition to the common life of the day. They demand by their very existence a return to first principles, a revolution in the ways of thinking and acting, an heroic consistency and single-mindedness. By effecting within their own soul a renewal of moral and spiritual life, they hasten the reform of the social order. On the material which life offers to them they build fresh constructions. These innovators and rebels have acted as a strong motive power in Hindu history, spending the greater part of their precious energies in overcoming the dead weight of the inert, the credulous and the orthodox.[1] Insubordination to outworn customs is needed to disturb the complacency of the majority, who acquiesce in obsolete forms of thought and feeling. The new emphasis on the dignity and freedom of man demands a reshaping of the social order.

Now that Hindu law is codified there is no organisation to review the state of law and bring about changes. Interpretation by commentaries is no longer operative. In the case of judge-made law there are obvious limitations, which do not permit a radical reconstruction of the social order. Piecemeal legislation will not meet the new conditions. Dharma is an elastic tissue which clothes the growing body. If it is too tight it will give way, and we shall have lawlessness, anarchy and revolution. If it is too loose it will trip us and impede our movements. It should not be too far behind, or too far ahead of, intelligent public opinion. Old creeds have lost their power and old institutions their prestige; yet the spirit of India's past is a living one, and it reveals its secret anew to each succeeding generation. Some of the suggestions I make may not appeal to the orthodox; the radical may think that I am too

[1] Cp. Bacon: "A forward retention of custom is as turbulent a thing as an innovation; and they that reverence too much old times are but a scorn to the new."

conservative. I am stating what seem to me the urgent demands of our society.[1]

Religious Institutions

Religion is an aspiration to grow into the likeness of the Divine. It is to help us to live from the depths of spirit. Meditation and worship are the means by which the mind, temper and attitude to life are refined. The object of meditation is the supreme Godhead, which is in a strict sense ineffable. It is beyond all form; none can see it with the eye.[2] It can be compared to nothing concrete and empirical.[3] We can only say that the self is the ruler of all, the lord of all, the king of all.[4]

Our thought of the Supreme is, however, by means of images or pictures. Few there are who believe profoundly in God, and do not seek a symbol for their faith. Popular symbols have to be employed for the many who are not mentally fit to receive the true wisdom. We must not offend the little ones that believe, those of narrower intellectual horizon, who have also their rights. Otherwise they will be left in entire darkness. Teachers who are anxious to help and not to confuse, present philosophical truth in symbols intelligible to the crowd. Subtle truths are given mythological vesture. Symbolism is the vision of the Infinite in the finite. By its very nature a symbol does not subject the Infinite to the finite. It renders the finite transparent, and allows us to see the Infinite through it.[5] No image can be taken for the Supreme in its entirety. If it usurps the place of reality we have idolatry.

All imagery is necessarily infected with error.[6] There are, however, degrees of error. The image is only a symbol of the

[1] sulabhāḥ puruṣaḥ rājan, satataṁ priyavādinaḥ
apriyasya ca pathyasya vaktā śrotā ca durlabhaḥ.—*Rāmāyaṇa*.

[2] na sandṛśe tiṣṭhati rūpam asya, na cakṣuṣā paśyati kaścanainam.

[3] na tasya pratimā asti.

[4] sarvasya vaśī, sarvasyeśānah, sarvasyādhipatiḥ.—*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up.*, IV. 4. 2.

[5] The excavations of the prehistoric sites of the Indus valley civilisation disclosed seals with representations of human and animal figures. Worship of human and superhuman beings prevailed perhaps in that age, and the Vedic Aryans took it up from them. The Vedic gods were described as possessing the form of human beings. They were men of the sky (divonarāḥ). The earliest image so far known is that of Vāsudeva and Sankarṣaṇa dated 200 B.C.

[6] Cp. Isaac Pennington, one of the most notable of the seventeenth-century Quakers, who said long ago: "All truth is a shadow except the last—except the utmost; yet every truth is true in its kind. It is a substance in its own place, though it be but a shadow in another place, for it is but a shadow from an intenser substance; and the shadow is a true shadow, as the substance is a true substance."

supreme Godhead, intended to evoke a sense of the vast and ultimate reality. It suggests the essential truth of the Real that is beyond all forms. In the temple at Chidambaram, dedicated to Śiva as Naṭarāja, in the holy of holies (garbhagṛha) there is neither image nor superscription. Worship is directed, not to any limited embodiment of the deity, but to the all-enfolding cosmic spirit which is formless, yet contains all forms, the light which is the source of all lights. On a bare wall in a dark room a garland, which is visible and tangible, is hung round the neck of the Invisible and the Intangible. Madhusūdana Sarasvati, the author of *Advaitasiddhi*, says that he does not know of a reality higher than the personal Lord Kṛṣṇa.[1]

Heraclitus says: "He who prays to an image is chattering to a stone wall." We pray not to the stone, but to the person figured in it, the psychological presence, the cosmic power.

Meditation on the superpersonal, and worship of the personal, aspects are advised. Men pass before God in single file, each with a name and destiny peculiarly his own. The language of God to man is always 'Thou,' not 'you.' In solitude man learns the secret of his self. The gifts of spirit cannot be had at second-hand. God dwells in the innermost sanctuary of every human heart. Meditation is the worship of the God within.

The first condition of meditation is complete honesty. We must at least be as honest as our weakness permits. We must learn to understand the true character of the excuses we generally profess to ourselves. Through meditation we pass from the trivialities of life to the presence of the eternal. A man is what he thinks, and our prayer is that our mind may be full of noble thoughts.[2] Those for whom abstract meditation is hard can select forms congenial to their temperaments. These forms are not imaginary, but are the forms of the Supreme assumed for the welfare of the seekers [3]; and these forms continue till universal dissolution.[4] Even if they are shadows, they are cast by the Light of lights. The religious

[1] pūrṇendusundaramukhād aravindanetrāt
kṛṣṇāt paraṁ kim api tattvam aham na jāne.

[2] tan me manah śivasamkalapam astu.

[3] Cp. cinmayasyāprameyasya nirguṇasya'śarīriṇaḥ
sādhakānāṁ hitārthāya brahmaṇo rūpakalpanā.

[4] ābhūtasamplavam sthānam amṛtattvaṁ hi bhāṣyate.—*Viṣṇu Purāna*.
Yāska in the *Nirukta* (VII. 4) says that the various gods are sub-members (pratyangāṇi) of the one self (ekasyātmanah). *Bṛhaddevata* (1. 70. 4) tells us that the deities are variously designated according to the distribution of their spheres of activity (sthānavibhāgena).

symbol is the symbol of the truth cherished by the believer. If it were unreal, it could not act in this way. Unless there is a correspondence between our deepest spirit and the religious representation, we shall not be impressed by it. The question is not one of scientific truth, but deals with the inner relation that exists between the transcendent reality and our deepest self, which cannot be treated as an object. If the souls are prepared to realise this relation, the truth is manifest. Hinduism tries to guide each nature according to its own lines, so that it might attain its fullest development. The spirit of God is at work in whatever is honest, true and loving in one's faith. God is the reality of the world, not the monopoly of this or that sect. Hinduism recognises that the powers of human nature, which bear witness to God, are developed in different degrees in different individuals; therefore there are bound to be many paths up the steep hill, though all meet at the top. The medium of worship is largely traditional and charged with historical associations. We need not regard this as a concession to polytheism. There is a fundamental difference between worship given to a plurality of beings who are regarded as independent of, or even as hostile to, one another, and worship given to beings who are conceived as aspects of one single supreme spirit. Numerous saints and angels figure in the calendars of the great Christian Churches, and yet the sects are monotheistic. But all the time there is in Hinduism a recognition of the subordinate character of image worship, however essential it may be for ordinary people. "Identity with the Supreme is the highest, the stage of meditation is the next, lower still is the stage of repeating hymns and mantras, and lowest of all is external worship." [1] Another verse says that "numberless acts of worship are equal to a hymn, numberless hymns are equal to a repetition of a mantra; numberless mantra repetitions are equal to meditation, and numberless acts of meditation are equal to mergence into the highest." [2] Whatever God we worship is identified with the Supreme. "And I bow to Thee, Gaṇapati, Thou only creator and Thou only protector, Thou only destroyer, Thou only unmistakably Brahmā," [3] says the *Atharva Veda*. The Supreme as the mother of

[1] uttamo brahmasadbhāvo dhyānabhāvastu madhyamaḥ
stutirjapo'dhamobhāvo bahih pūjā'dhamādhamaḥ.

[2] pūjakoṭisamam stotraṁ stotrakoṭi samo japaḥ
japakoṭisamaṁ dhyānaṁ dhyānakoṭisamo layah.

[3] namaste gaṇapataye, tvam eva kevalaṁ kartāsi, tvameva kevalaṁ hartāsi, tvameva kevalaṁ khalvidaṁ brahmāsi.

the universe is identified with the Absolute Godhead. "Thou who art Thyself prosperity in the mansions of the virtuous, poverty in the hovels of the sinful, intelligence in the hearts of those whose minds are cultivated, faith in the good, modesty in the well born, to Thee we make obeisance. O Goddess, protect the universe."[1] We worship God in the form of the chosen ideal. Śaṁkara was a great advaitin, he was also an ardent worshipper of Śaktī. In his *Sūtra Bhāṣya*, he writes: "For widowers and for bachelors also, knowledge is possible through special acts of dharma as prayer and propitiation of divinities."[2] He says: "One has to select for oneself one of the forms of worship and meditation, and remain firm upon it, until through the direct perception of the object of meditation the fruits of the meditation are obtained."[3] Śaṁkara himself chose the Śaktī aspect and composed some soul-stirring hymns. He founded several shrines, the chief being those at Sṛngeri, Dvāraka, Pūri and Jyotirmaṭha in the Himālayas.

The main aim of the Hindu faith is to permit image worship as a means to the development of the religious spirit, to the recognition of the Supreme who has his temple in all beings.[4] In the *Bhāgavata* the Lord is represented as saying: "I am present in all beings as their soul, but ignoring My presence the mortal makes a display of image worship."[5] We are permitted to resort to it, when we have not attained the spiritual maturity to realise the presence of the

[1] yā śrīh svayaṁ sukritināṁ bhavaneṣu alaksmīh pāpātmanām kritadhiyāṁ hṛdayeṣu buddhih,
śraddhā satāṁ kulajanaprabhavasya lajjā, tāṁ tvāṁ natāhsma paripālaya devi viśvam.—*Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*.

[2] III. 4. 35.

[3] *Sūtra Bhāṣya*, III. 3. 59. Cp. "God himself," said the Platonist, Maximus of Tyre, "is the father and fashioner of all that is; older than the sun or the sky, greater than time and eternity and all the flow of being, unnamable by any law-giver, unutterable by any voice, not to be seen by any eye. But we, being unable to apprehend his essence, use the help of sounds and names and pictures, of beaten gold and ivory and silver, of plants and rivers, mountain peaks and torrents, yearning for the knowledge of Him, and in our weakness naming all that is beautiful in this world after his nature, just as happens to earthly lovers. To them the most beautiful sight will be the actual lineaments of the beloved, but for remembrance sake they will be happy in the sight of a lyre, a little spear, a chair perhaps, a running ground, or anything in the world that wakens the memory of the beloved. And should I further examine and pass judgment about images? Let men know what is divine, that is all. If a Greek is stirred to the remembrance of God by the art of Pheidias, and an Egyptian by paying worship to animals, another man by a river, another by fire, I have no anger for their divergences; only let them know, let them love, let them remember."—*Maximus of Tyre*, VIII. 9. 10. E.T. by Gilbert Murray: *Five Stages of Greek Religion*, p. 100.

[4] bhūtātmanām krtālayam.

[5] ahaṁ sarveṣu bhūteṣu bhūtātmā avasthitaḥ
tam avajñāya māṁ martyah kurute arcāviḍambanam.—III. 29. 21.

Supreme everywhere and anywhere. "Doing one's duty, one should worship Me the Lord in images and the like, only so long as one does not in one's heart realise Me as established in all beings." [1] Images are for the feeble-minded, for the sage sees the Supreme everywhere.[2] The uneducated have a natural leaning to image worship, but its subordinate character cannot be overlooked. A well-known verse urges that the practice of the presence of God is the highest kind of religion; those who are incapable of it are required to practise meditation and contemplation; if we are unable to rise to this level, image worship may be adopted; and for the raw and the primitive, offerings and pilgrimages are advised.[3]

When we know the principle underlying image worship, we shall not quarrel about the images used. The Hindu admits that nothing can be known except in the mode of the knower. *Cāṇakyanīti* says: "Neither in wood nor in stone nor in clay is the deity. The deity is there by virtue of mystic feeling. Therefore the mystic feeling is the cause." [4] The fruit of worship follows the faith of the doer.[5] A true symbol carries with it layer upon layer of meaning, and speaks at different levels of understanding to all. As our faith deepens, its meaning becomes more adequate. We may start with any symbol, and as our attitude grows the symbol approximates to reality. The Hindu realises not only that all roads lead to the one Supreme, but that each one must choose that road which starts from the point at which he finds himself at the moment of setting out.

The spirit of worship must be embodied in ritual and institutions. The religious life of the community must be given sensible and institutional expression. Without it, worship seldom develops its full richness and power. If our spiritual aspiration is not to remain thin and abstract it must, even to the risk of losing its purity, embody itself in forms which will make use of man's various powers and

[1] arcādav arcayet tāvat īśvaraṁ māṁ svakarmakṛt
yāvaṁ na veda svahṛdi sarvabhūteśvavasthitam.

[2] agnir devo dvijātīnāṁ yogināṁ hṛdi daivatam
pratimāsu alpabudhhīnāṁ sarvatra samadarśinām.

In the words of Dādu: "There is no need of going either to the temple or to the mosque; for the real mosque and the temple are in the heart, where the service and the salutations can be offered to the Lord."

[3] uttamāsahajāvasthā dvitīyā dhyānadhāraṇā
tritīyā pratimāpūjā, homayātrā caturdhikā.

[4] na devo vidyate kāṣṭhe, na pāṣāṇe na mṛṇmaye
devo hi vidyate bhāve tasmāt bhāvo hi kāraṇam.—VII. 12.

[5] śraddhānurūpaṁ phalahetukatvāt.—*Bhāgavata*, viii. 17.

capacities. There is, of course, the danger that form will smother spirit, ritual action take the place of spontaneous prayer, the outward and visible sign obscure the inward grace. Yet it is by means of sacred objects and ceremonial acts that man's worship gets rooted in the concrete facts of life, and develops the power to change life itself. The temple ceremonial, the different items of worship, pilgrimages, are the vehicles of unspoken convictions.

The Vedic Āryans possessed no temples and used no images. The Dravidian culture promoted image worship, and insisted on pūjā in place of yajña. The various treatises on temples and image worship took their shape after Hinduism grew out of Vedism. Vedic hymns were, however, used, and the inspiring genius of the seers fused the Vedic and the Non-Vedic elements, and gave to the Āgamas equal authority with the Vedas. Temples are the visible symbols of Hindu religion. They are earth's prayers to heaven. They are situated in solitary and impressive places. The great peaks of the Himālayas are in their majesty and purity the natural setting for the great temples. The practice of going to the river bank at the break of dawn, in order to worship, has been observed for many centuries. The beauty of the buildings with their repose and mystery, the dim lights with the suggestion of aloofness and awe, the song and the music, the image and the worship, all have suggestive power. All arts, architecture, music, dance, poetry, painting and sculpture are used to make us feel the indefinable power of religion, for which no art is an adequate vehicle. Those who participate in the worship are united with historic Hindu experience, and with profound spiritual forces which have moulded what is best in our heritage.

At the moment, however, the temples present an air of dull acquiescence and tedious routine. To attempt to abolish temples, which are so passionately loved and affectionately revered, is vain. But we must improve the tone and the atmosphere. The instinctive love of beauty and sublimity must be developed. Beautiful statues must be constantly before the eyes of the worshippers. Our sense of the beautiful must be satisfied by the temple ritual, which is intended to predispose the mind for feeling the mysterious presence of God. Worship in temples must be of the purest form. While offerings of flowers and incense may be permitted, sacrifices of animals should be forbidden. Even in the *Ṛg Veda* it is said that devout offerings of praise, or fuel sticks or cooked food, are as good

as sacrifices.[1] The wise man does not cause injury to any creatures except in the case of sacred rites.[2] The doctrine of ahiṁsā, as well as the view of defilement caused by eating flesh, led to the adoption of vegetarianism. The influence of Aśoka and the spread of Vaiṣṇavism led many to regard abstention from flesh as meritorious. Vast populations in India today have voluntarily given up meat eating, though their ancestors were meat eaters for ages.[3] After all, the principle of sacrifice is the offering of one's all to God, and the doing of one's work in a spirit of dedication to God. The *Bhāgavata* says: "This, O Brāhmin, has been indicated as the cure for the threefold miseries, viz. the offering of action to the Lord, the Master and Supreme Being." [4]

Temples have been for long centres of culture. Artists dedicated their best works, poets recited their poems and musicians sang first in temples, before they went out. All consecrated forms of loveliness induce in us a feeling for the eternal. Temples must become institutions of the people and be accessible to all. Those who make their living from the temples, the Paṇḍas, who are essentially coarse and mercenary, should be encouraged to acquire learning and refinement. Temple worship is used to encourage faith in God, and purity of mind and conduct. Dedication of girls to temples cannot be expected to induce the right frame of mind.

The spirit of religion is kept up by family worship in the home, where women play a leading part. Worship in temples and seasonal festivals attract large crowds. The Bhāgavatars, the trained story-tellers and reciters, travel from village to village expounding the classics; the ācāryas, or the heads of ascetic orders, preserve the tradition and train the young. The chief support of Hindu religion has been the prophet. He comes from nowhere and is supported by no authority. India has had an unbroken succession of these prophets in every part of the country and in every period of her life, from the ṛṣis of the Upaniṣads and the Buddha to Rāmakṛṣna and Gāndhi.

The numerous fasts and vigils, the detailed regulations about eating and drinking, are intended as aids to self-control. Manu

[1] VIII. 19. 5; VIII. 24. 20; VI. 16. 47.

[2] ahiṁsān sarvabhūtāni anyatra tīrtebhyaḥ.—*Chāndogya Up.*, VIII. 15. 1.

[3] Manu says that no sin is incurred in eating meat when one's life is in danger: V. 27, 32.

[4] etat samsūcitaṁ brahman tāpatrayacikitsitam
yad īśvare bhagavati karma brahmaṇi bhāvitam.

says: "There is nothing unnatural about eating flesh or drinking wine, or sexual intercourse, for all creatures are inclined to them; abstention from them merits great reward." [1] The *Mahābhārata* says that "One's desires are never satisfied with their indulgence, but they flare up like the fire with clarified butter poured into it." [2] The Hindu sages used ritual only as a means to inner purification. Gautama, in his *Dharma Sūtra*, describes the forty sacred ritual observances which a good man ought to perform, and says: "These are the forty sacred observances. And now the eight good qualities of the soul. They are compassion for all creatures, patience, freedom from discontent, purity, earnest endeavour, auspicious thought, freedom from avarice, freedom from envy. He that has performed all the sacred observances, and has not these good qualities, comes not into union with Brahman, comes not to his world; but he who has performed only one of these sacred observances and has the good qualities enters into union with Brahmā, comes into his world." [3] Virtue is a matter of spiritual excellence. The moral virtues are to be practised by all.[4]

It is the moral side of pilgrimages that is emphasised. *Vīramitrodaya* quotes the *Mahābhārata* to show that the person who is greedy, deceitful, cruel and vain, and attached to worldly objects, cannot be purified by his bath in all the holy places. He will remain sinful and unclean. We do not become pure merely by washing the dirt from the body; we become pure by getting rid of the internal pollution.[5] The holy places are holy because men devoted to God live there.[6] It is said that by bathing in the Ganges the worst forms of sin are removed; but 'Ganges' stands for the very flow of dharma.[7] The *Mahābhārata* says that "studying all the Vedas or bathing in the holy waters is not worth, O best of kings, even a sixteenth part

[1] na māmsabakṣaṇe doṣo na madye na ca maidhune
pravṛttir eṣā bhūtānām nivṛttis tu mahāphalā.

[2] na jātu kāmah kāmānām
upabhogena śāmyati
haviṣākṛṣṇavartmeva
bhūyaevābhivardhate.—I. 75. 49.

[3] VIII.

[4] ete sarveṣāṁ brāhmaṇādya caṇḍālaṁ dharmasādhanam.—*Mitākśara* on *Yājñavalkya*, VI. 22.

[5] yo lubdhaḥ piśunaḥ krūro dāmbhiko viṣayātmakaḥ
sarvatīrtheṣvapi snātaḥ pāpo malina eva saḥ
na śarīramalatyāgaṁ naro bhavati nirmalaḥ
mānase tu male tyakte bhavatyantaḥ sunirmalaḥ.

[6] bhavadvidhā bhāgavatās tīrthabhūtāḥ svayaṁ vibhoḥ
tīrthīkurvantitīrthāni svāntaṣthena gadābhritā.—*Bhāgavata*, I. 13. 10.

[7] sā hi dharmaḥ dravaḥ svayam.—Yama, quoted in *Smṛticandrikā*.

of the merit of speaking the truth." [1] Again: "This vast universe is the holy temple of God, a pure heart is the sacred place of pilgrimage, and truth eternal is the immortal scripture." [2] The way to cross the waters of life is the observance of moral rules. "Do not deprive others of anything, do not wound others' feelings. Always think of God." [3]

The ancestral sacrifice of the Vedas is different from the śrāddha, though it originated in the *pitṛyajña*. In *Gautama* [4] and *Āpastamba*,[5] details of the śrāddha rite are given. The simple ancestral worship is replaced by the śrāddha. Those who are competent to perform the ceremony are defined. Three generations of ancestors were celebrated originally, and from the time of Manu three more were added to the list. A distinction is made between the three immediate ancestors and the three beyond them. The former are entitled to piṇḍas or balls of food, and the latter to parts thereof. While Manu provided for the śrāddhas of paternal ancestors, Yājñavalkya and his followers laid down the rule that the three immediate maternal ancestors were also entitled to piṇḍas from the sons of their daughters.[6] Śrāddha is an act of veneration for ancestors. We show that we remember them, hold them in reverence, and offer them symbolical food and water to allay their hunger and thirst. It is an act of imaginative communion with the dead.

If cow-protection is enjoined as a religious duty, it only shows that the tradition of centuries has not been snapped. When agricultural life displaced the nomadic life of the hunter, when the food producer took the place of the food gatherer, the cow, which provided milk for daily food and helped agricultural processes, became a great help for the household. Even today, among the Hindus who are vegetarians, milk and its products are highly

[1] sarvavedādhigamanaṁ sarvatīrthāvagāhanam
satyasyaiva ca rājendra kalāṁ nārhati ṣoḍaśīm.

[2] suviśālam idam viśvaṁ pavitraṁ brahmamandiram
cetas sunirmalo tīrthaṁ satyaṁ śāstram anaśvaram.

Cp. also *M.B.*:
sādhūnāṁ darśanaṁ puṇyaṁ tīrthabhūtāhi sādhavaḥ
kālena phalate tīrthaṁ sadyah sādhusamāgamaḥ.
nāmbhomayāni tīrthāni na devā mṛcchilāmayāḥ.
te punanty urukālena darśanād eva sādhavaḥ.

[3] kasyacit kim api no haraṇīyam
marmavākyam api noccaraṇīyam
śrīpateḥ padayugaṁ smaraṇīyam
līlayā bhavajalaṁ taraṇīyam.

[4] XV.

[5] II.

[6] "After funeral obsequies have been duly performed, in honour of paternal ancestors, balls of food should also be offered to maternal ancestors."—I. 24. 2.

valued. The cow came to be regarded as the foster-mother of the human race. From early times religious sanction was given to the protection of the cow.[1] So long as the majority of India continue to depend on agriculture, and machine-farming is not applied, protection of the cow is useful. But there is nothing religious about it. The cow is the symbol of the animal world, and respect for the cow means respect for animals. And yet callousness to the suffering of animals, and the slaughter of animals for sport and sacrifice, are rampant in India today, however much they may be opposed to the Hindu spirit. Many Hindu princes and people do not seem to be concerned about it.

Caste and Untouchability

Caste divisions are based on individual temperament,[2] which is not immutable. In the beginning there was only one caste. We were all Brāhmins [3] or all Śūdras. A smṛti text says that one is born a Śūdra, and through purification he becomes a Brāhmin.[4] People were divided into different castes according to social needs and individual action. The Brāhmins are the priests. They should have neither property nor executive power. They are the seers who constitute the conscience of society. The Kṣatriyas are the administrators, whose principle is reverence for life. The Vaiśyas are the traders and craftsmen, men of technical ability who aim at efficiency. The routine workers, the proletariat, are the Śūdras. They take no interest in their work as such, where they carry out instructions and contribute only a fraction. They lead a life of innocent impulse and adopt traditional ways. Their joy is in the fulfilment of family obligations of marriage and parenthood, and other personal relationships. The caste groups are more trade guilds in charge of the cultural, political, economic and industrial sections of the community. Hinduism has drawn to its fold the Āryan, the Dravidian and the Mongoloid races which had drifted

1 Cp. *Cāṇakya*:
adau mātā guroḥ patnī brāhmaṇī rājapatnikā
dhenur dhātrī tathā prthivī saptaitā mātaraḥ smṛtaḥ.

2 sattvādhiko brāhmanaḥ syāt kṣatriyastu rajodhikaḥ
tamodhiko bhaved vaiśyo guṇasāmyattu śūdratā.

3 *Bṛhadāranyaka Up.*, I. 4. 11-5; *Manu*, I. 31. Cp. also *Mahābhārata*, XII. 188:
na viśeṣosti varṇānāṁ sarvaṁ brāhmam idaṁ jagat
brahmaṇā pūrvasṛṣṭaṁ hi karmabhir varṇatāṁ gatam.

4 janmanā jāyate śūdraḥ samskārair dvija ucyate.

into the Ganges valley from the East, and the Pārthian, Scythian and Hun invaders from beyond the Himālayas. It brought into its fold a great variety of different peoples and conceded to its converts, though always with a change of form, the retention, within the new religion, of rites and traditions belonging to their old faiths. In the *Mahābhārata,* Indra tells the emperor Māndhātṛ to bring all foreign people, like the yāvanas, under the Āryan influence.[1] Hinduism has a bewildering variety of racial types at all levels of development. In the period of the *Ṛg Veda* we have the distribution between ārya and dāsa, and there were no rigid divisions among the Āryans themselves. In the time of the *Brāhmaṇas,* the four classes became separated into rigid groups dependent on birth. As arts and crafts grew in number and complexity, castes based on occupations developed. The smṛtis trace the innumerable castes to intermixture of the four varṇas, by means of anuloma and pratiloma marriages. When the Vedic Āryans found a heterogeneous population of various tribes and classes of different races and colour, worshipping different gods and spirits, following diverse customs and habits of life, and filled with the spirit of tribalism, they attempted to fit them all into an organic whole by the adoption of the fourfold classification. The four orders supersede the original racial differences. It is a classification based on social facts and psychology. The recognition of the spirit in man is the essential feature of Hindu religion, and in this respect all men are equal. Caste is diversity of function, and the goal of life is a transcendence of caste diversity by distinterested service. The caste scheme is meant to apply to all mankind. In the *Mahābhārata* we are told that the Yāvanas (Greeks), the Kirātas, the Daradas (Dards), the Chinas (the Chinese), the Sakas (Scythians), the Pahlavas (Parthians), the Savaras (Pre-Dravidian tribes), and several other non-Hindu peoples, belonged to one or the other of the four classes.[2] These foreign tribes were absorbed into Hindu society. The sort of social adjustment, by which foreigners are admitted into the Hindu fold, has taken place from very early times. So long as the foreigners followed the general tradition and common law of the society, they were treated as Hindus. The great empire-builders, the Nandas, the Mauryas and the Guptas, were according to the orthodox view low-born. The Gupta emperors married Licchavis, who were regarded as Mlecchas. Latterly, some Hindus have married European and American

[1] *Śāntiparva,* 65.

[2] *Śāntiparva,* 55. See also *Manu,* X. 43-44.

women. Though strong racial differences operate, intermarriages have not been unsatisfactory. If social conditions are helpful, they will be more successful.[1] The system was designed to unite, first the heterogeneous population of India, and then of the whole world, in one common economic, social, cultural and spiritual bond. By assigning definite functions and duties, and according rights and privileges, the different classes were expected to work in co-operation and to achieve racial harmony. It is a mould into which all human beings can be poured, according to their vocational aptitude and temperament. The basis of the varṇa dharma is that every human being must try to fulfil the law of his development. We must discipline our life in conformity with the pattern of our being, instead of wasting our energies in following those which we lack.

While it was the intention of the scheme to develop the requisite spirit and tradition in the members of the classes by a proper employment of the forces of heredity and education, it was not viewed in a rigid way. In special cases individuals and groups changed their social class. Viśvāmitra, Ajāmīḍha and Purāmiḍha were admitted to the status of the Brāhmin class, and even composed Vedic hymns. Yāska, in his *Nirukta*, tells us that of two brothers, Santānu and Devāpi, one became a Kṣatriya king and the other a Brāhmin priest. Kavaṣa, the son of the slave girl Iluṣa, was ordained as a Brāhmin priest at a sacrifice.[2] Janaka, a kṣatriya by birth, attained the rank of a Brāhmin by virtue of his ripe wisdom and saintly character.[3] The *Bhāgavata* tells of the elevation of the kṣatriya clan named Dhaṣṭru to brahminhood. Jātyutkarṣa is provided for. Even though a Śūdra, if you do good, you become a Brāhmin.[4] We are Brāhmin not on account of birth or the performance of

[1] Lord Bryce, an excellent observer, said of Brazil: "Brazil is the one country in the world, besides the Portuguese colonies in the east and west coasts of Africa, in which a fusion of the European and African races is proceeding unchecked by law or custom. The doctrines of human equality and human solidarity have here their perfect work. The work is so far satisfactory that there is little or no class friction. The white man does not lynch or maltreat the Negro; indeed, I have never heard of a lynching anywhere in South Amercia except occasionally as part of a political convulsion. The Negro is not accused of insolence and does not seem to develop any more criminality than naturally belongs to any ignorant population with loose notions of morality and property. What ultimate effect the intermixture of blood will have on the European element in Brazil I will not venture to predict. If one may judge from a few remarkable cases it will not necessarily reduce the intellectual standard."—*South America, Observations and Impressions*, pp. 477, 480.

[2] *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, II. 19.

[3] *Rāmāyaṇa*. *Bālakāṇḍa*, 51-55.

[4] ebhistu karmabhir devī śubhair ācaritaiś tathā
śūdro brāhmaṇatāṁ yāti, vaiśyāh kṣatriyatāṁ vrajet.

rites, not by study or family, but on account of our behaviour.[1] Even if we are born Śūdras, by good conduct we can raise ourselves to the highest status.[2]

The human being is always becoming. His essence is in movement, not an arrested moment. There was healthy social mobility, and for long varṇas did not become hereditary, crystallised castes. The occupational divisions, however, did not work, even from early times. Megasthenes gives us a division different from the caste groupings. He puts the class of statesmen and officials at the top, and hunters and junglemen as the sixth division. Patañjali refers to Brāhmin kings, and Manu to Śūdra rulers. There were Brāhmin soldiers in the time of Alexander, as there are today. Whatever the intentions were, caste developed a sense of false pride, and led to the humiliation of the lower classes. In the *Rāmāyaṇa* Rāma kills Śambhuka for performing austerities.[3] Manu's unfortunate references to the Śūdras were perhaps motived by his opposition to Buddhism, which allowed them the highest religious life of learning and monasticism. These were for Manu the Śūdras, who assume the airs of the twiceborn.[4] Manu limits the right to study the *dharmaśāstras* to Brāhmins, while Śaṁkara holds that members of all castes can read them. When excessive formalism overtook the early scheme, protests were uttered by the followers of Jainism and Buddhism, who emphasised the ideal of maitrī or human brotherhood. Especially those who were denied opportunities to rise to the full heights of their powers accepted the new faiths. Hindu ācāryas denounced the spirit of caste separatism. *Vajrasūcikopaniṣad* holds that many who were born of non-brāhmin women had risen to the rank of Brāhmin saints.[5] But soon caste bigotry and prejudices asserted themselves, and drove many of those subjected to them into the fold of Islam. To rekindle the dying embers of life and light in Hindu society, preachers of human

[1] na yonir nāpisamskāro naśrutam na ca santatiḥ
kāraṇāni dvijatvasya vṛttam eva tu kāraṇam.

And again:
sarvoyaṁ brāhmaṇo loke vṛttenaca vidhīyate
vṛttisthitastu śūdropi brāhmaṇatvaṁ niyacchati.—*Anuśāsanaparva*.

[2] śūdrayonau hi jātaśya sadguṇān upatiṣṭhataḥ
vaiśyatvaṁ labhate brāhmaṁ kṣatriyattvaṁ tathaiva ca
ārjave vartamānasya brāhmaṇyam abhijāyate.—*Araṇyaparva*.

[3] Kalidasa on *Raghuvaṁśa* (XV. 42. 57), and Bhavabhūti, in *Uttararāmacarita*, put him in heaven.

[4] śūdrāmś ca dvijaliṅginaḥ.

[5] jāty antaresu anekajātisambhavāt maharṣyayo bahavas santi vyāsah kaivartakanyāyām, vaśiṣṭha ūrvasyām . . . agastyah kalaṣajāta iti śrutatvāt.

brotherhood like Rāmānanda and Caitanya, Kabir, Nānak, Dādu and Nāmdev arose. As the result of the liberalising influence of Western civilisation, caste customs are being slowly modified, and connubial restrictions are getting slackened. Ram Mohan Roy, Dayānand Sarasvati and Gāndhi, among others, contributed to the silent revolution.[1] They found much support in the spirit of the ancient scriptures. A vipra is so called because of his Vedic learning, and a Brāhmin because of his knowledge of God.[2] A famous verse of the *Mahābhārata* makes out that we are all born Brāhmins, and happen to belong to the different classes on account of our conduct and occupation.[3] The whole world was of one class, and the four groups became established on account of their conduct.[4] The Hinduisation of aboriginal tribes has been going on slowly and unobtrusively, through the natural attraction of higher ideals. For it to be speedy and successful, the caste Hindus should give up their spirit of aloofness and haughtiness. Caste divisions have prevented the development of homogeneity among the Hindus. To develop a degree of organic wholeness and a sense of common obligation, the caste spirit must go. We have to get rid of the innumerable castes and outcastes, with their spirit of exclusiveness, jealousy, greed and fear.

Physical purity (śaucam) is a means to inner purity. Cleanliness is a first aid to godliness. Our ideas of cleanliness must become more scientific. In olden times the Brāhmins, the Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas could eat food cooked by each other. Manu says that a twice-born man should not eat food cooked by a Śūdra,[5] but that which is prepared by a slave, a family friend and co-sharer in the profits of agriculture, could be taken.[6] In our times such distinctions are untenable and irritating, and restrict free social movement. In ancient times meat was used by the Brāhmins also. The old Vedic religion included the sacrifices of five kinds of animals:

[1] Even the Hindu Mahāsabha resolved: "Whereas the caste system based on birth as at present existing is manifestly contrary to universal truth and morals: whereas it is the very antithesis of the fundamental spirit of the Hindu religion: whereas it flouts the elementary rights of human equality . . . this all India Hindu Mahāsabha declares its uncompromising opposition to the system and calls upon the Hindu society to put a speedy end to it."

[2] vedapāṭhena viprostu brahmajñānāt tu brāhmanaḥ.

[3] Cp. the popular verse:
anādāv iha samsāre durvāre makaradhvaje
kule ca kāminīmūle kā jāti parikalpanā.

[4] eka varnam idam pūrvaṁ viśvam āsīd yudhiṣṭhira
karmakriyāviśeṣeṇa cāturvarṇyaṁ pratiṣṭhitam.—*Āranyaparva*.

[5] IV. 232; *Gautama*, xvii. 1.

[6] IV. 253; *Āpastamba*, 1. 18. 9, 13, 14.

goats, sheep, cows, or bulls, and horses.[1] Under the influence of Buddhism, Jainism and Vaiṣṇavism, the practice became discredited. Manu and Yājñavalkya impose so many restrictions about meat eating that they discourage it. In some parts (Bengal, Kashmir), even today, Brāhmins take meat, while in others (Gujarat) even the lower castes abstain from it. Our habits are to be based on principles of cleanliness, not on taboos. Pollution by touch must be given up. Untouchability arises in many ways: by the violation of caste rules, by the pursuits of certain occupations, by the adoption of certain non-aryan faiths. The sin of untouchability is degrading, and the prejudice should be removed. The *Bhagavadgītā* points out that there are only four varṇas based on natural aptitude and vocation,[2] and two classes of persons, divine (daiva) and demoniac (āsura).[3] Manu states that there are only four divisions and no fifth.[4] Any discrimination against the Harijans is unjustified. If a Śaṁkara avoided an 'untouchable' it was only to be told that it is improper.[5] Places of worship, public wells, and public utilities such as cremation grounds and bathing ghats, hotels, and educational institutions, should be open to all. Reform in these matters has been more effective in the Indian States ruled by Indian princes.[6] What is being done today is a question not of justice or charity, but of

[1] I. 17. 30, 37.

[2] cāturvarṇyaṁ mayā sṛṣṭaṁ guṇakarmavibhāgaśaḥ.

[3] XVI. 6.

[4] brāhmanah kṣatriyo vaiśyas trayo varṇa dvijātayaḥ
caturthā ekajātis tu śūdro nāsti tu pañcamaḥ.—X. 4.

[5] annamayād annamayam athavā caitanyam eva caitanyād
dvijavara dūrīkartuṁ vāñchasi kiṁ brūhi gaccha gaccheti.

At the Round Table Conference in London (1931) Gāndhi said: "Let this Committee (minority committee) and let the whole world know that today there is a body of Hindu reformers who feel that untouchability is the shame, not of the untouchables, but of orthodox Hinduism, and they are therefore pledged to remove this blot. . . . I would far rather that Hinduism died than untouchability lived. . . . I want to say with all the emphasis that I can command that if I was the only person to resist this thing, I would resist it with my life."

[6] The late Mahārāja Gaekwar of Baroda introduced very many salutary reforms, and declared that the Hindu temples under state management shall be open to all classes of Hindus, including the Antyajas. On 12th November 1936, H.H. the Mahārāja of Trāvancore issued the following proclamation:

"Profoundly convinced of the truth and validity of our religion, believing that it is based on Divine guidance and on an all-comprehending toleration, knowing that, in its practice, it has throughout the centuries adapted itself to the needs of changing times, and being solicitous that none of my Hindu subjects should by reason of birth or caste or community be denied the consolations and solace of the Hindu faith, I have decided and hereby declare, ordain and command that, subject to such rules and conditions as may be laid down and imposed for preserving their proper atmosphere and maintaining their rituals and observances, there should henceforth be no restriction placed on any Hindu by birth or religion on entering or worshipping at the temples controlled by Government."

atonement. Even when we have done all that is in our power, we shall not have atoned even for a small fraction of our guilt in this matter.

Sacraments

Among the samskāras or sacraments the chief are: (1) jātakarma, or birth; (2) upanayana, or initiation into spiritual life; (3) vivāha, or marriage; (4) antyeṣṭi, or funeral ceremonies. The others, like nāmakaraṇa, giving a name for the child, annaprāsana, giving cooked food to the child for the first time, vidyārambha, or starting education for the child, are of a popular character, expressing love and affection for the child. Excepting upanayana, they are practised by all Hindus, though in different forms. Upanayana is spiritual rebirth. The first birth involves disunion, separation, submission to necessity. The second is spiritual birth into union and liberty. The first involves a purely external form of existence; the second means that life is lived on a deep interior level. The sacrament of upanayana is of Indo-Iranian origin. Its essence is in imparting the sacred Gāyatrī mantra. It is a prayer addressed to Savitṛ (the Sun),[1] who is regarded as the Source and Inspirer of the cosmos. All truth is symbolic. The Sun, which is the immediate source of light and life, expresses the nature of divinity much better than any conceptual sign. It is the foremost visible manifestation of the Divine power. The mantra means: "We meditate on the effulgent glory of the divine Light; may he inspire our understanding." [2] In the period of the Upaniṣads, upanayana was a simple ceremony. The student approached the teacher with fuel (samidh) in his hand, and expressed a desire to enter the stage of studenthood (brahmacarya). The putting on of the hide of the antelope, fasting and other ceremonies come down to us from the time when Vedic Āryans dwelt in the forests. When Satyakāma Jābāla speaks the truth to Gautama Haridrumata, the latter says: "Fetch, dear boy, fuel, I shall initiate you." [3] The ceremony becomes very elaborate in the Sūtras and Smṛtis. The wearing of the sacred thread with the well-known mantra [4] is the

[1] *Ṛg Veda*, III. 62. 10.

[2] tat savitṛ vareṇyaṁ bhargo devasya dhīmahi dhiyo yo naḥ pracodayāt.
The sun is employed as an image of God in the Vedic and other traditions, of which usage Dante remarks: "No object of sense in the whole world is more worthy to be made a type of God than the Sun."

[3] *Chāndogya Up.*, IV. 4. 5.

[4] yajñopavītaṁ paramaṁ pavitraṁ prajāpater yatsahajaṁ purastāt
āyuṣyamagryaṁ pratimuñca śubhraṁ yajñopavītaṁ balamastu tejaḥ.

symbol of initiation. Though the Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas had a right to it, they do not all seem to have exercised it. The Sandhyā has become mixed up with non-Vedic elements and has many constituents: ācamana (sipping of water), prāṇāyāma (breath-control), mārjana (sprinkling one's body with water to the accompaniment of mantras), aghamarṣaṇa (offering of water (arghya) to the sun), japa (repetition of gāyatrī), upasthāna (reciting of mantras by way of worship to the sun in the morning, and to Varuṇa in the evening), upasamgrahaṇa (repeating one's gotra and name, saying "I salute," touching one's ears, clasping the feet and bending one's head).

It is essential that the important sacrament (samskāra) of upanayana should be permitted for all Hindus, men and women, for all are capable of the highest goal of spiritual insight. Regarding the pathways to the goal, different forms are prescribed. The Vedic path is open to the three upper classes[1]; the *Bhāgavata* says that for women, Śūdras and degraded Brāhmins there is no access to the Veda, and the compassionate sage has provided for them the epic *Mahābhārata*.[2] In ancient times the prohibition of Vedic study was not so strict.[3] The intolerance on this point in the period of the *dharma śāstras* was so extreme that Gautama prescribes drastic penalties for the violation of this rule.[4] Śaṁkara says that while the Śūdra has no adhikāra for brahmavidyā based on a study of the Veda, he can attain spiritual development, even as Vidura and Dharmavyādha did, and attain to spiritual freedom (mokṣa), the fruit of wisdom.[5] Jaimini states that, according to Bādari, even Śūdras could perform Vedic rites.[6] Manu,[7] Śankha[8] and Yama allow sacraments to Śūdras, but without Vedic mantras. Whatever be the reason of it, it smelt of spiritual snobbery and gave rise to much discussion and many feuds.

Whatever might have been the case in the past, it is essential that our spiritual inheritance should be thrown open to all those who call themselves Hindus. Some Śaivite and Vaiṣṇava saints belong to the class of untouchables, and others are not Brāhmins. Many who are not members of the Brāhmin class have attained to

[1] Exceptions were, however, made of the rathakāras (carpenters) and niṣāda sthapati (architects).

[2] strīśūdradvijabandhūnāṁ trayo na śrutigocarā.
iti bhāratam ākhyānaṁ muninā kṛpayākṛtam.—I. 4. 25.

[3] *Chāndogya Up.*, IV. 1-2. [4] XII. 4. [5] S.B., I. 3. 38.

[6] nimittārthena bādaris tasmāt sarvādhikāram syāt.—I. 3. 27. See also *Bhāradvāja Srauta Sūtra*, V. 2. 8; *Kātyāyana*, 1. 4. 5.

[7] X. 127. [8] *Viśvarūpa* on *Yājñavalkya*, I. 13.

the highest ideal of sanctity and god-realisation. Every religious reformer attempts to raise the whole community to the Brāhminical level with its ideals of truth, non-violence, non-possession and self-restraint. They have formulated methods by means of which persons of disciplined life can scale caste barriers. The śramaṇas who adopt the Buddhist view, and observe the vows of chastity and voluntary poverty, are the equals of the Brāhmins. The great devotees (bhaktas) rose above caste barriers. The doors of self-realisation with all its opportunities were open to myriads of women. The theory of the equality of all men from a spiritual standpoint, the fact that even those who do not belong to the three upper castes have attained self-realisation, and the admission of the Hindu legislators that even Śūdras have a right to self-realisation,[1] require us today to open out to all Hindus, irrespective of their caste or status, the spiritual heritage. Brāhminhood is not an order, but a temperament. Anyone can have it, though many born in the Brāhmin caste may be without it. It is independent of sex or calling, birth or breeding. Everyone has a right to Brāhminhood, the state where inward grace and outward beauty fuse.

The Gāyatrī prayer is coeval with India's cultural history, and must be taught to all men and women, high and low. It assumes that there is a perpetual restlessness with things as they are, an eternal seeking for a better way, a continual progress towards a better world. The greatest gift of life is the dream of a higher life. Each one aspires for a deeper, intenser and wider self-consciousness and clearer self-understanding. We must strive to bring into existence something better than oneself. Even sceptics and theists can adopt it, without a compromise of their intellectual conscience. It presupposes faith in the human soul, and in an end to human effort. It is the symbol of the true religion, which is spiritual adventure, perpetual renewal. God is perpetual rebirth. We must find ourselves naked and without the mask of falsehood. We are then reborn.

A Hindu, for our purposes, is one who adopts in his life and conduct any of the religious traditions developed in India on the basis of the Vedas. Not only those who are born of Hindu parents,

[1] *Vīramitrodaya* says that even though the Śūdras are not expected to study the Vedas, they can attain self-realisation by a study of the smṛtis and the purāṇas; for they have a right to the highest self-knowledge: ātmapratipādakapurāṇaśravaṇena ātmajñānaṁ bhāvayet.

but those who trace Hindu ancestry on either side and do not belong to Islam or Christianity, are Hindus.

In recent times Hinduism has shown an indisposition or incapacity to adapt itself to the needs of the time. To be in too great a hurry to make fundamental concessions to changing circumstances shows a lack of confidence in the principles of our tradition; but never to change at all is stupid. To fight for the old system, as it has come down to us, is to fight on the wrong front. The great ideals of our culture cannot be discarded; but their embodiment in forms and institutions we must get beyond. There is no reversing history. We must steer clear of a radical revolution, as well as of a return to the past. In our weariness, we are sometimes tempted to give up the past and make an entirely fresh start. Tradition is felt as a heavy burden, which affords no adequate protection against the chaos that is breaking over us, and yet hampers a fresh start in life. Such a course will not pay. From a study of the imperishable principles that have been evolved on our past history, we must develop new institutional safeguards for the protection of human dignity, freedom and justice. The genuine forces of the new must be woven with the valid principles of the past into a new unity. This country has shown a glorious constancy in maintaining its ideals through long ages of oppression. Never has the flame of hope been quenched. It burns most brightly against the dark background of alien rule. But radical changes in our social habits and institutions are essential, if India is to be saved from spiritual and physical death. We must now reorganise our religious thought and practice, if Hinduism is to recover its conquering force and power to advance, penetrate and fertilise the world.

Lecture IV

WOMEN IN HINDU SOCIETY

Introductory—Women in Ancient India—Love in Human Life—Physical Basis—Racial Factor—Friendship—Love—Marriage and Love—The Hindu Ceremony—Forms of Marriage—Early Marriages—Choice of Partners—Polyandry and Polygamy—The Status of Widows—Divorce—Social Reform—Birth Control—Attitude to Failures.

Introductory

In regard to the question of the relations of men and women it is wise to be less solemn and more sincere. We tend to fake a part to the world in these deepest matters of life. Where truthfulness and inward integrity should prevail, pretence and artificiality pervade. It is better to face the facts honestly and devise plans which are not too ideal. The pattern of goodness, the code of moral action we set before men, must be such as they can follow. It must be relevant to the world in which we live, where the structure of social habit and behaviour is being undermined, and society is being dissolved and shaped anew.

Men, who are responsible for many of the views about women, have indulged in fantastic stories about their nature and men's superiority to them. They have nearly exhausted their ingenuity in portraying the mystery and sanctity of women, as well as their glamour and instability.

Women in Ancient India

When it is said that the male and the female are like puruṣa and prakṛti, it is meant that they are complementary. The bisexuality of the human race conditions a division of labour. There are certain functions which man cannot undertake. This specialisation does not rob women of their femininity; nor does it spoil the natural relationships of men and women. Man is the creator and woman the lover. Her special qualities are grace and tenderness, peace and affection, surrender and sacrifice. Brutality, violence, anger,

hatred are not her typical features. Masculine dominance is not natural. There were eras and forms of society in which masculine domination was not nearly so certain as we ignorantly assume. The fruits of grace will save woman more effectively than the masculine virtues. The differences are essential and are meant for mutual education.[1] The Zulu dictionary defines man as an animal trained by women. She is essentially the educator of man, both when he is a child and an adult. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* says: "because the father is born again of his wife (jāyate punaḥ) she is called jāyā. She is his second mother." [2] *Gītagovinda* opens with a verse where Rādhā is enjoined to lead Kṛṣṇa home, to further the fulfilment of his nature, as he is a timid child.[3] When the sky is overcast with clouds, the path of the future lies through a thick forest, and when we are utterly alone in darkness without a single ray of light, when all around are difficulties, we place ourselves in the hands of a loving woman.

The female child is called by the name duhitṛ, which is the English daughter, and the term indicates the prominent duty of milking the cow. Weaving and needlework, household duties and watching the crops, are her main duties.[4] Education was regarded as quite important. While Brāhmin girls were taught Vedic wisdom, girls of the Kṣatriya community were taught the use of the bow and arrow.[5] The Bārhut sculptures represent skilful horsewomen in the army. Patañjali mentions the spearbearers (saktikis). Megasthenes speaks of Chandragupta's bodyguard of Amazonian women. Kauṭilya mentions women archers (strīgaṇaiḥ dhanvibhiḥ). In the houses as well as in the forest Universities of India, boys and girls were educated together. Ātreyi studied under Vālmīki along with Lava and Kuśa, the sons of Rāma.[6] Fine arts like music, dancing and painting were specially encouraged in the case of girls. Till recently, women proved themselves capable of performing efficiently

[1] When a French Deputy pleaded for votes for women and remarked how little difference there was between male and female, the entire chamber rose and shouted: " Vive la différence "!

[2] 2. VII. 13.

[3] meghair meduram ambaraṁ vanabhuvaśyāmas tamāladrumaiḥ
naktaṁ bhīrurayaṁ tvam eva tad imaṁ rādhe gṛhaṁ prāpaya. . . .
bhiruh śiśutvāt bhayaśīlaḥ.

[4] See *Raghuvaṁśa*, IV. 20.

[5] *Ṛg Veda*, I. 112. 10; X. 102. 2. Maṇḍana Miśra's wife had the intellectual ability and independence to arbitrate between her husband and Śaṁkara on a philosophical dispute.

[6] In his *Mālatīmādhava*, Bhavabhūti makes Kāmandakī study along with boys.

work which is generally assigned to men.[1] Yet till today the view persists that women are inferior to men in intellectual competence.[2] A Chinese proverb says: "A man thinks he knows, but a woman knows better."

In the Vedic age the highest expression of religion is the sacrifice. Husband and wife both took part in it. Prayers and sacrifices were offered jointly by them. Girls had upanayana performed for them and carried out the sandhyā rites. "A young daughter who has observed brahmacarya should be married to a bridegroom who is learned like her." [3] Sītā is mentioned as performing sandhyā rites.[4] Hārīta holds that women are of two classes, brahmavādini and sadyovadhū.[5] The former do not get married and so study the Vedas and perform the prescribed rites, and the latter have the upanayana performed about the time of marriage. Yama is quoted to show that girls in past ages had the girdle, studied the Veda and recited the hymns.[6] Manu holds that marriage should be regarded as the substitute for upanayana for girls,[7] but in view of the past practice, and the spirit that husband and wife are complementary halves of one whole, the two should have the same

[1] In a letter to Mrs. Charlotte Manning, J. S. Mill writes: "You ask me for information respecting the administrative capacity shown by so many ladies of ruling families in India, and especially whether these ladies are Hindus or Mahomedans. They are almost all Hindus. The case can seldom arise in a Mussulman Principality, as by Mahomedan law the mother is not regent for her minor son, whereas among Hindus the mother by birth or adoption is regent of right. One of the most remarkable, however, of these ladies, the late Sikander Begum of Bhopal, was a Mahomedan. As the Native States were in my Department in the India House, I had opportunities of knowing all that was known about the manner in which they were governed; and during many years, by far the greater number of instances of vigorous, forceful and skilful administration which came to my knowledge were by Ranees and Raees as regents for minor chiefs."

[2] Henry James, writing about Mrs. Oliphant's novel *Kirsteen*, says: "I was at once confirmed, after twenty pages, in my belief, as I laboured through the book, that the poor soul had a simple feminine conception of literature, such slipshod, imperfect, halting, faltering, peeping, down-at-heel work—buffeting along like a ragged creature in a high wind, and just struggling to the goal and falling in a quivering mass of faintness and fatuity." On the other hand, Virginia Woolf complains that it is a man-made world, where the chief occupations of men are the shedding of blood, the making of money and the wearing of uniforms such as dons in their gowns, bishops in their robes, judges in their wigs and generals with their ribbons.

[3] *Yajur Veda*, VIII. 1.

[4] *Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 87. 19; VI. 4. 48. The *Bhāgavata* refers to the daughters of Dākṣāyaṇa, who were greatly skilled in problems of philosophy and religion (IV. 1. 64).

[5] dvividhāḥ striyaḥ brahmavādinyaḥ sadyovadhvaśca. tatra brahmavādinīnām upanayanam agnīndhanaṁ vedādhyayanaṁ svagṛheca bikṣācarya, sadyovadhūnāṁ tu upasthite vivāhe kathamcit upanayanamātraṁ kṛtvā vivāhaḥ kāryaḥ.

[6] purākalpeṣu nārīṇāṁ maunjībandhanam iṣyate / adhyāpanaṁ ca vedānām sāvitrīvacanaṁ tathā. brahmacaryena kanyāyuvānāṁ vindate patim.—*Atharva Veda*, XI. 5. 18. Gobhila refers to the bride who wears a sacred thread, yajnopavītinīm (II. 1. 19).

[7] II. 67.

rights to spiritual life and discipline. Even when unmarried, men and women have the same claim for spiritual growth.

There was no religious obligation that every girl should be married. To be a wife and a mother is undoubtedly the most important, highly skilled and difficult task that a woman can perform, but one is not to be compelled to do it. Democracy is not so much a form of government as the recognition of the value of the individual, whether he be man or woman, outcaste or criminal. There is right through the realisation that, for some spirits, it is possible to achieve their aims when they lead a single life, and that the pleasures of love and marriage, like those of social life, are distractions from the life of spirit. If there are persons who are content with celibacy, if they are inclined to it by nature, if they wish to be left alone and undisturbed, there is no reason why society should not let them have their single freedom. It is unfair to force them into a domesticity for which they are not suited. The whole tradition of school and society, small talk and the selfishness of parents who wish to see themselves perpetuated, the fear of not having any successor to pray for one's soul, the so-called 'dharma,' force even unwilling individuals into marriage. Latterly, however, on account of economic and other conditions, unmarried people are on the increase.

There are, however, a few women who are of a 'masculine' type, energetic and ambitious. They fight for the prizes of life, and are interested in sports and politics. They try to avoid all relations of love and marriage. If by accident they enter into such relationships, they strive to be superior to their husbands and disturb the harmony of married life. They take pride in proving that they never developed a talent for domesticity. Though these cases are few, society will have to allow for them. Such 'masculine' women do not reach the highest of which womanhood is capable.

Seclusion of women was unknown. Young girls led free lives, and had a decisive voice in the selection of their husbands. On festive occasions and at tournaments (samana) girls appeared in all their gaiety.[1] Women had a share in the property of the father,

[1] I. 48. 6; I. 124. 8; IV. 58. 8. Kaegi gives the picture of a *samana* when he writes: "Wives and maidens attire themselves in gay robes and set forth to the joyous feast; youths and girls hasten to the meadow when forest and field are clothed in fresh verdure, to take part in the dance. Cymbals sound, and seizing each other, lads and damsels whirl about until the ground vibrates and clouds of dust envelop the gaily moving throng."—*Ṛg Veda*, p. 19.

and they were sometimes allowed to remain unmarried, with their parents and brothers.[1] The *Atharva Veda* refers to daughters remaining with their parents until the end of their lives.[2] A part of the ancestral property is given to them as dowry, which becomes their own property, and is called strīdhana in later writings.

In the Epic period, women did not suffer from any special disabilities. They practised austerities and wore garments (valkala). Dhritavratā, Śrutavatī, Sulabhā remained unmarried and pursued the life of spirit.

Under the shadow of the great ideal of saññyāsa, the weaknesses of women were exaggerated as a warning to monks.[3] To encourage renunciation, women were despised as the source of worldliness. Hemacandra looks upon them as "the torch lighting the way to hell." [4] According to a great religious tradition, scarcely had woman been created than she was accused in the revealing sentence: "The woman tempted me." Christian Europe has been brought up on the belief that death would have been unknown but for the unkindness of women. She was accused of treachery, backbiting and tempting men to their doom. But Varāhamihara (sixth century A.D.) urges that the pursuit of the ends of dharma (righteousness), and artha (wealth), depends on women, and that they are essential for human progress. He complains against the other-worldly, who overlook the good qualities of women and emphasise their weaknesses.[5] The faults of women are the faults of men also. To speak the truth, they have more virtues than men can claim.[6]

Left to themselves, without the guidance of any tradition, women are neither more nor less constant than men. Their sexual tendencies are no less variational than those of men.[7] Woman is

[1] See *Ṛg Veda*, I. 117. 7. amājur is the name for a girl who has become old in her father's house. See II. 17. 7; X. 39. 3; VIII. 21. 5.

[2] I. 14. 3.

[3] Cp. na vai strīṇāni sakhyāni santi salāvṛkāṇāṁ hrdayāni etā. ("With women there can be no lasting friendship; their hearts are like those of hyenas.")—*Ṛg Veda*, X. 95. 15. Let us remember that this was said by Ūrvasī the courtesan. See also "the mind of women cannot be controlled" (striyā aśāsyaṁ manah).—VII. 33. 17.

[4] bījaṁ bhavasya narakamārgadvārasya dīpikā. Cp. Tertullian's bitter cry: "The sentence of God is on this sex of yours in this generation. You are the devil's gateway, you destroy God's image in man." A Latin author says: "Woman is the confusion of man" (*Mulier est hominis confusio*).

[5] yepi anganānāṁ pravadanti doṣān vairāgyamārgeṇa guṇān vihāya.

[6] guṇādhikaḥ. Euripides protests in his *Medea* against the treatment meted out to women: "Of all things that have life and sense, we women are most wretched; for we are compelled to buy with gold a husband who is also, worst of all, the master of our person. . . . They tell us that we live a sheltered life at home while they go to wars; but this is nonsense. For I would rather go to battle twice than bear a child once."

[7] Cp. George Sand: "The virtue of woman is a fine invention of man."

not an innocent lamb, nor is man a devouring monster. In early times promiscuity was the fashion, and it was not regarded as sinful. Women used to go about as they liked.[1] Whenever conditions permitted, they rejected the monogamous relationship. Among the natives of Victoria, the women have so many lovers that it is almost impossible to tell the true paternity of the children.[2] In Arabia and Madagascar women of rank, despite a marital connection with only one man, have many lovers. The burden of child-bearing inclines woman to the monogamous life. If freed from economic subservience, she is not likely to be more monogamous than man. A monogamy which is interrupted by frequent divorces is only nominal. There are references in the *Mahābhārata* to regions where promiscuity prevailed, the land of the Uttarakurus [3] and the city of Māhiṣmati.[4] It is sanctioned by precedents and praised by great sages.[5] The *Mahābhārata* says that Śvetaketu felt mortally wounded when his mother was taken in hand by another Brāhmin in the presence of his father, who quietly declared that this was ancient usage. He said: "The women of all classes on earth are free, O son; men in this matter, as regards their respective classes, act as kine." [6] Śvetaketu is given the credit for supplanting promiscuity by regular marriage.[7] A single standard for both men and women was then laid down. "The wife who does not adhere to her husband will be sinful from this date; she will commit as great and heinous a sin as the killing of an embryo. The men who will go to other women, neglecting a chaste and loving wife who has observed from her youth the vow of chastity, will commit the same sin." [8] Monogamous marriage is not a natural condition, but a

[1] kāmacāravihāriṇyaḥ svatantrā.—*Mahābhārata*, I. 122. 4.
[2] See W. Winwood Reade, *Savage Africa*, Second Edition (1864), p. 259.
[3] yatra nāryah kāmacāra bhavanti.—XII. 102. 26.
[4] svairiṇyās tatra nāryo hi yatheṣṭaṁ vicaranty uta.—II. 32. 40.
[5] pramāṇadṛṣṭo dharmo'yaṁ pūjyate ca maharṣibhiḥ.
Cp. " O lady of sweet smiles, this ancient usage, very favourable to women, had the sanction of antiquity; the present practice has been established only very recently."
(strīnām anugrahakaraḥ sa hi dharmaḥ sanātanaḥ
asminstu loke cirān maryādeyaṁ suciṣmite.)—I. 122. 8.
[6] anāvṛtāhi sarveṣāṁ varṇānām anganā bhuvi
yathā gāvas sthitas tāta sva sva varṇe tathā prajāḥ.—I. 122. 14.
("In the animal world it is the female who determines whom she will permit to approach as mate. In the human world also the final decision rests with the woman. No woman can be led astray unless she desires it.")
[7] I. 128.
[8] vyuccarantyaḥ patiṁ nāryā ādyaprabhriti pātakam
brūṇahatyasamaṁ ghoraṁ bhaviṣyaty asukhāvaham
bhāryāṁ tathā vyuccaratah kaumārabrahmacāriṇīm
pativratām etad eva bhavita pātakaṁ bhuvi.—I. 122. 17-18.

cultural state. The traces of promiscuity belong to the pre-Vedic stage, as the institution of marriage is well established by the time of the *Ṛg Veda*.

Marriage became an obligation to women, possibly as a reaction against Buddhism and Jainism. Dīrghatamas ruled that women should not remain unmarried in future.[1] Manu argued that woman should have all the sacraments, but without the Vedic formulas.[2] The only Vedic sacrament for them is marriage.[3] The smṛtis condemn prolonged celibacy, and exalt the householder's status. A wifeless man is not eligible for sacrificial rites.[4] It is in *Manu* and the *Dharmaśāstras* that the doctrine of the perpetual dependence of women on men is enunciated.[5] For them woman is a fragile plant, to be cared for and nourished by man. The later commentators revel in increasing the restrictions on women. We, however, get exalted ideas of womanhood even in *Manu*, not to speak of poets like Kālidāsa, Bāṇa and Bhavabhūti. Though there are certain passages which declare that the woman has not equal rights with man for Vedic duties, the main view is that she is entitled to perform them, either as wife along with the husband, or as maiden independently. When later her position deteriorated, the bhakti religion arose, satisfying all the religious needs of women.

In spite of heavy disabilities from which they suffered, women enjoyed certain advantages. They are not to be killed, whatever be their crimes; they are not to be abandoned, even when guilty of adultery. Gautama prescribes that a wife guilty of adultery should undergo a penance, and be kept under guard.[6] Vaśiṣṭha[7] says that "the wives of Brāhmins, Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, who commit adultery with a Śūdra, may be purified by a penance if no child is born, but not otherwise."[8]

[1] apatīnaṁ tu nārīṇām adya prabhṛti pātakam.—*Mahābhārata*, I. 114. 36.

[2] II. 36.

[3] II. 37

[4] ayājñiko vā eṣa yo apatnikaḥ.—*Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, II. 2. 2. 6.

[5] pitā rakṣati kaumāre bhartā rakṣati yauvane / putro rakṣati vārdhakye na strī svātantryam arhati.—*Manu*, IX. 23.

Aristotle argues that the idea of justice does not strictly apply to a man's relation to his wife and children because justice does not apply to one's property. Even in the crowning period of Greek culture, the position of women was hard.

[6] 22. 35.

[7] XXI. 12.

[8] Vyāsa held that "a wife who is guilty of adultery should be kept in the house, but deprived of her rights in religious and conjugal matters and in property, and should be treated with scorn; but when she has had her monthly course after the act of adultery (and does not repeat it) the husband should allow her the usual rights of wife as before."—II. 49-50.

Love in Human Life

The great achievements of the world have for their inspiration a woman's love. Geniuses like Kālidāsa,[1] conquerors like Napoleon, scientists like Michael Faraday, and many other world-makers and world-forsakers, bear witness to the important part played by love in their lives. What stirs lyrical poets to their finest flights is the delight of the senses, the fruitful contentment as well as the fatal passion of love. A woman was the centre of the conflict between Rāma and Rāvaṇa in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and the Trojan war was fought for the possession of a woman. The impulse of love is the fire at the heart of life itself; it is the voice of all creativeness. Many have missed achieving their life's work, worthy of their talents, for lack of a beloved presence by their side. The *Divina Commedia* was inspired by the love that Dante treasured for Beatrice, even when she had become the wife of another. The immortal poems of Caṇḍidās were inspired by his love for a young peasant girl; and a queen was the inspiration of Vidyāpati's songs. Beethoven poured out his rhapsodies to the "immortal beloved."

In discussing the relations of men and women, Hindu legislators avoid the extremes of prudery and prurience. That famous student of sex, love and marriage, Havelock Ellis, writes that in India "sexual life has been sanctified and divinised to a greater extent than in any other part of the world. It seems never to have entered into the heads of the Hindu legislators that anything natural could be offensively obscene, a singularity which pervades all their writings, but is no proof of the depravity of their morals. Love in India, both as regards theory and practice, possesses an importance which it is impossible for us even to conceive." [2]

While nature provides the raw material, the human mind works on it. Without this our sex life would be as uninteresting as that of apes and dogs. When the natural instinct of sex is guided by brain and heart, by intelligence and imagination, we have love. Love is neither mystic adoration nor animal indulgence. It is the attraction of one human being to another, under the guidance of the highest sentiments. Marriage, as an institution, is a device

[1] According to the legend, Kālidāsa wrote his three great works *Kumārasaṁbhava*, *Meghasaṁdeśa* and *Raghuvaṁśa*, impelled by the first question of his wife, asti kaścit vāgarthaḥ ? The three words happen to be the first words of the three works respectively.

[2] *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, VI. 129.

for the expression and development of love. Marriage is not a mere convention, but an implicit condition of human society. Though its ideals have changed, it seems to be a permanent form of human association. It is an adjustment between the biological purposes of nature and the sociological purposes of man. Whether it is successful or not depends on the way it is worked. It can lead us to an earthly paradise, or in certain conditions it may turn out to be an organised hell.

The present tendency is towards greater individual freedom. Restraints, physical and moral, are not popular. As our knowledge of the unconscious and of the nature of repression increases, conventional morality is becoming suspect.[1] To the invitation to contribute to *The Book of Marriage*, edited by Count Hermann Keyserling, Bernard Shaw replied: "No man dare write the truth about marriage while his wife lives. Unless, that is, he hates her like Strindberg: and I don't. I will read the volume with interest, knowing that it will consist chiefly of evasions." [2] On the social side, increasing industrialisation and the democratisation of culture are diminishing the significance of the family life. Women are becoming economically independent; social and political privileges are getting equalised, and attempts are being made to endow motherhood. All this is likely to introduce radical changes in the pattern of domestic life.

If we are to think usefully on an ancient institution like marriage, if we are to distinguish the essential from the accidental, we should analyse the several tendencies and motives that have led to the origin and growth of the institution. We will then discover that many of the things we value in marriage, and in sex relations generally, are impositions of law or custom framed by our intellect and imagination.

So far as the origin of the institution of marriage is concerned, neither romantic love nor animal lust is at its basis. There was no reason for primitive man to limit his freedom in the exercise of the sexual instinct. He did not place any value on the chastity of woman or the paternity of man. He knew neither sexual jealousy

[1] Cp. Freud: "What the world calls its code of morals demands more sacrifices than it is worth, and its behaviour is neither dictated by honesty nor instituted with wisdom."—*Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis* (1922), p. 362.

[2] There is another equally interesting saying of Bernard Shaw. When he married, someone asked him, "Well, what do you think of marriage?" "It is difficult to answer," he replied. "I might say it is like freemasonry; those who are not received into the order cannot talk about it, and those who are members are pledged to eternal silence."

nor romantic love. Primitive marriage was based on the subjugation of woman, and its durability rested on economic necessity, not on evanescent passion. Anthropologists tell us that the primitive husband willingly lent his wife, in her capacity of sex mate, to any guest as the merest act of hospitality. But he was jealous of his ownership of her as a worker. With the development of a more settled life, and the accumulation of possessions, the desire to perpetuate ownership through legitimate heirs gave additional support to the institution of marriage.[1] Soon, with the growth of civilisation, the recognition of the wife as a person, not merely as a slave labourer or propagating animal, arose with far-reaching effects on the institution of marriage.

Physical Basis

To look upon sex as something unclean or indecent is a sign of moral perversion. Freud's emphasis on the sex basis of human life, though exaggerated, is not incorrect. Sexual instincts are not inherently disgraceful. The Hindu view has no sympathy with the relentlessly severe attitude adopted by Christianity.[2] Jesus did not marry; and the whole idea of immaculate conception indicates that there is something unclean about normal sex life. "Marriage peoples earth," said St. Jerome, "but virginity heaven." He writes: "There are virgins in the flesh who are not in the spirit, whose body remains untouched but whose soul is corrupt. Only a virginity which has never been soiled, by a desire either of flesh or of the spirit, is a worthy offering to Christ." If we are to be perfect, we must cut out sex life and the normal family affections. Our

[1] Demosthenes expressed the general feeling of the Greeks: "We have prostitutes for pleasure, concubines for the daily care of the body, and wives for the production of children and as trusty caretakers of our homes." Quoted in Westermarck, *Future of Marriage in Western Civilisation*, p. 23.

[2] St. Paul says: "It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency. But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment. For it is better to marry than to burn. But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called. They that use this world, as not abusing it; for the fashion of this world passeth away." Then comes the finishing stroke: "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife."—1 *Corinthians* vii.

vision and hope are restricted to a relative perfection. In the imperfect condition of married life, we are to live perfectly.

On the other hand, the Hindu looks upon sex life as sacred. The *Rāmāyaṇa* opens with a curse on the hunter who separated the two birds lost in the ecstasy of sex union.[1] Sex is not a disease or a perversion, but a natural instinct.[2] The Hindu view exalts the state of the householder. As all living beings depend on the support of the mother, so do all the stages of life depend on the support of the householder. "The house is not the home, it is made by the wife; a home without a wife is to me like a wilderness."[3] "Home is not what is made of wood and stone; but where a wife is, there is the home."[4] The Hindu view does not suffer men and women to become saints, striving for a vacuous perfection. It does not make of sexual abstinence an absolute virtue. If we do violence to natural forces, they will sooner or later seek their revenge. The author of the *Kāma Sūtra* gives us an account of the different sides of sexual life and attraction, presents us with those stirrings of the human heart that make life so full and poignant. His whole account, with its ardent love of life and passionate spiritual serenity, has nothing in common with the abstinence solicited by the votaries of suffering. Spiritual freedom is to be secured, not by the arbitrary suppression of desires, but by their judicious organisation. To purge the spirit from the dross of the flesh is not to destroy the flesh. Celibacy is like the ascetic discipline of fasting, and other quietings of the body. It is dangerous, since it recalls the mind to the subject which it would like to avoid. It produces a negative sort of bondage. The highest ideal, even in sex matters, is that of non-attachment, to use the relations when valuable and forgo them without trouble.

In Hindu practice marriage is not only tolerated, but extolled. The ascetic tendency to impose dangerous restraints on life is denounced. God, who made us male and female, is not to be mocked. Austere ideals of sanctity, which require us to save our souls at the risk of destroying the species, are opposed to our natural instincts. Though the physical urge is not to be mistaken for anything deep or permanent, it is essential as the basis on which a durable and

[1] mā niṣāda pratiṣṭhāṁ tvam agamaḥ śāśvatīḥ samāḥ
yat krauñca midhunād ekam avadhīh kāmamohitam.

[2] Cp. the words of Montaigne: "Are they not themselves beasts, those who designate as bestial the act which caused them first to see the light?"

[3] na gṛhaṁ gṛham ity āhur, gṛhiṇī gṛham ucyate,
gṛhaṁ ca gṛhiṇī hīnam āraṇyasadṛśam mama.

[4] na gṛhaṁ kāṣṭhapāṣāṇair dayitā yatra tad gṛham.—*Nītimañjari*, 68.

satisfying relation is built. If the physiological aspects are unsatisfactory, marriages turn out unsuccessful.[1] But they are not enough. Kant's definition of marriage as "the tying together of two persons of different sex to a lifelong reciprocal possession of their sexual qualities" is defective. If it were true, marriage would be dissolved with the coming of sexual frigidity. Even as life is not physiology, love is not sex. Gratification of sex impulses is not like taking a cup of coffee. It is not a trivial, inconsequential event which leaves no memory behind it. It results in affection, friendship and love. The casualness of modern sex life is a sign of growing vulgarity.

In man sex has acquired certain peculiar qualities. Man has no periodicity. He eats without being hungry, drinks without being thirsty, and indulges in sex at all seasons. This privilege is shared by the large ape, the orthograde primate. Secondary sexual characteristics acquire primacy over the central features. We fall in love with a face, or eyes, or brains. The impulse can turn back toward the same sex. Human beings are capable of protracted parental care. Few animals care for the young. The partnership between the dog and the bitch is of short duration. The crane and its female take interest in the young, and so their relationship is of longer duration. But as soon as the young grow up, the relationship of the parents to the young is forgotten. There are no such ties as those of brother and sister.

The basic urges of human nature must be fulfilled. For normal people an intimate relation with an individual of the other sex is a necessity. Biologically, the failure to satisfy the sex instinct leads to nervous instability; psychologically it results in emptiness and misanthropy. Here and there, there may be individuals like John the Baptist, Jesus, St. Paul, or Śaṁkara, who are able to divert the life-energy from its natural course, and use it for spiritual achievement; but for the vast majority of men and women, and for the race as a whole, the sex relation is one of the most urgent and important.

Racial Factor

What Fabre calls the "universal instinct of maternity" is the most marvellous side of even animal life, where we find love and sacrifice and protection of the weak. Even the ferocious tiger becomes a tender mother. The Hindu scriptures speak of the three

[1] Cp. "With my body I thee worship."

debts [1] we have to pay: to the ṛṣis by Vedic study, to the gods by sacrifices, and to ancestors by offspring. "Gifts that were made by a childless woman robbed the receiver of his life powers." "As long as man is not united to a wife, he is only half a man; the home that is not surrounded with children is like a graveyard." [2] The feeling for the continuity of the family is one of the strongest of social forces. The family is a cell in the social body, and if the cell loses the desire to reproduce itself the race dies. France fell, said Pétain, because France had too few babies. A declining birth-rate is a symptom of that indifference to the future which we find in the final phase of a dying civilisation. "Do not cut off the thread of offspring" is the advice of the Upaniṣad, and it must be followed if the race is to survive.[3] Without children, the sex union, however beautiful and sacred, will remain incomplete. Sterility is one of the grounds on which marriage with another woman is sought to be justified.

Marriage is more a social charter for the establishment of a legitimate family than a licence for sexual intercourse. The mutual attachment between husband and wife becomes stronger when a child is born. They may hurt and hate each other; but something stronger than their whims, something more enduring than their quarrels and hatred, has grown up between them. The parental instinct for the welfare of the child is common to both parents. This unity of interest is not artificial. It is the expression of a basic truth in human nature, nay, all nature, which has planted in the mother heart an enduring affection and readiness for self-sacrifice. Parenthood helps to build lifelong emotional bonds and complex cultural ties on biological foundations. Social relationships of mutual obligation and service are established by its means. By the time the biological needs get weakened, affection for the children grows up; and through the exercise of parental affection we acquire a knowledge of the world and inward experience. Children are a source of spiritual sustenance to the parents.

The birth of a son was sought with eagerness and that of a daughter was looked upon with disfavour, possibly because, in

[1] brahmacaryeṇa ṛṣibhyo yajñena devebhyaḥ prajayā pitṛbhyaḥ.—*Taittirīya saṁhitā*, VI. 3. 10. 5.

[2] yāvan na vindate jāyāṁ tāvad ardho bhavet pumān
yan na bālaiḥ parivṛitaṁ smaśānam iva tad gṛham.

[3] Cp. "Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful and will multiply him exceedingly." "A woman is a riddle whose solution is a child," says Nietzsche.

the struggle for existence against physical forces, men were more useful than women. In patriarchal societies, and in primitive conditions, a son is economically more valuable than a daughter. This does not mean that parents loved their daughters less. Cultured people even then adopted a more healthy view. An educated daughter is the pride of the family.[1] As interest in ancestor worship increased, sons alone were regarded as eligible for offering oblations to the *manes*. There is also the difficulty of procuring suitable husbands, and even after marriage there is a large element of chance in regard to the future. This difficulty of securing happiness for girls is the cause of preference for boys, and not any unfairness to the female sex.[2]

Not all women have the maternal instinct. Some are better wives than mothers. The two are quite distinct. There are women who want sexual life without motherhood, and women with little or no sexual desire who want motherhood. The two tendencies attempt to be reconciled in the institution of marriage.

Friendship

Men and women are not superior animals, nor is the aim of marriage mere stock-breeding. Love is not a narcotic where the two are lost in each other at the biological level; nor are human beings mere instruments of race-preservation. Apart from the biological side, there is the need for comradeship which marriage supplies. There is the desire for awareness, for communication, for the sharing of intellectual pleasures, for tenderness, in short, for completeness of experience. We cannot live entirely to ourselves. We do want friends; but friendship is of spurious value if we cannot communicate and exchange our deepest ideas. If we succeed in getting friends in whom we have absolute confidence, with whom we can share our innermost thoughts and feelings, we deepen our individuality. If, on the other hand, we enter into relations with others, just to escape from the bonds of our individuality, it is a form of self-indulgence, a mere relief from boredom. We relinquish our life at the centre for a doubtful one at the periphery. Love, accord-

[1] kanyeyaṁ kulajīvitam.—*Kumārasaṁbhava*, VI. 63. Cf. also:
vidyāvatī dharmaparā kulastrī loke nārīṇāṁ ramaṇīyaratnam.

[2] putrīti jātā mahatīha cintā kasmai pradeyeti mahānvitarkaḥ
datvā sukhaṁ prāpyati vā na veti kanyāpitṛutvaṁ khalunāma kaṣṭam.
Pañcatantra, Mitrabheda, 5.

ing to Rainer Maria Rilke, "consists in this, that two solitudes protect and touch and greet each other." When Omar cries:

> Here with a Loaf of Bread beneath the Bough,
> A Flask of Wine, a Book of Verse—and Thou
> Beside me singing in the Wilderness—

he means that he cannot live or enjoy life unless she is 'beside' him. It is good companionship. The song on the lips expresses staunchness, truth, loyalty and loving care, things that we strive after and seldom reach. Friendship is different from sexual attraction. Society of intelligent and sympathetic women for men, and of men for women, cannot be forbidden. As it cannot be had purely at the Platonic level, wives are expected to be friends also. It is said that "the wife should be of one mind with the husband, like a shadow, should be his companion in all good works, and should always remain cheerful and be mindful of household duties."[1] The married woman of the *Ṛg Veda* is the comrade (sakhī) of the husband and has similar interests. What is called psychological complementation, or temperamental affinity, enables community of thought and feeling to arise and grow. Intellectual and aesthetic fellow-feeling, similarity of value scales, provide a promising starting-ground for a truly successful marriage. More even than community of ideas and aspirations, the sharing of sorrow serves as the foundation of human sympathy. Marriage does not aim, however, at producing identical individuals. Differences must be there, even as the difference of sex is there to start with. Only they must not be too great. If one is anaemic and the other fiery, if one is unimaginative and the other adventurous, the marriage will not be a success. The two should supplement each other, so that each is assisted to discover the self and grow into a genuine individual, and the two together achieve a harmony. The marriage relation is intended to contribute to both life and mind. While woman is entangled more in the activities which life has assigned to her, man is engaged more in the creations of mind. It is vital national service, to work hard, to serve and rear a family. If woman is engaged in activities which prejudice the work of preservation, she comes into conflict with her own inner nature. She is the giver of joy and the inspirer of activity, and she cannot do her part successfully if she imitates man. The

[1] chāyevānugatā svacchā sakhīv hitakarmasu
sadā prahṛṣṭayā bhāvyaṁ gṛhakarmasu dakṣayā.

modern woman is discontented with her rôle of child-bearing and home-making, and wishes to devote herself to some other 'higher' activity. While we should extend to women opportunities for education and employment, her main business will still be motherhood and the making of home.

If the institution of marriage does not provide for this essential relation of friendship, escapes are devised. In the great days of Athens, Pericles had for his concubine an accomplished Milesian woman, Aspasia. Demosthenes said in open court that "every man requires besides his wife at least two mistresses."

Love

The biological, the racial and the human elements are the foundations on which we attempt to build the beautiful temple of the creative life of the spirit. Love is more than sexual ease, propagation of the species or comradeship. It is a personal matter, in which intimate ties which are more valuable than the satisfaction of an animal need, or the founding of a family or selfish happiness, are found. Through love we create a spiritual reality, and develop our destiny as persons, through the pleasures of the flesh, the happiness of the mind and the joy of spirit. The tempests of the heart are taken over into the calm of the soul. Love is not merely flame meeting flame, but spirit calling to spirit.

In the concrete field of human life, equality is invaluable. The laws about marriage must be equal, no doubt; but at some point or other we have not only to acquiesce but delight in inequality. In true love there is that absolute surrender which alone can make it a success.[1] Pure love asks for nothing in exchange. It throws itself out without restriction or reservation. It makes light what otherwise is heavy. It carries a burden without feeling its weight. It is never weary, considers nothing impossible, and is ready to suffer all things. Such love is eternal. We have it in the depths of our soul, a sacred inviolable flame, which we can carry to the end of our lives. Such love has nothing in common with human desire, low, brutal, selfish, violent or petty, or feelings brittle, superficial, exacting. It is the force sent down to earth that the earth might get back to heaven. Such a communion of mind and spirit, as well

[1] mṛdutvaṁ ca tanutvaṁ parādhīnatvam eva ca
strīguṇā ṛṣibhiḥ proktā dharmatattvārthadarśibhiḥ.—*M.B.*, XIII. 12. 14.

as of body, is immortal. It is the purest relation, which makes us inwardly complete and contented. Love is all that one can call one's own. It is the one treasure of life, for everything else in life has been communised. It is life's supreme blessing, however bitter its afflictions may be, however lamentable its defects.

For most of us marriage is only a pairing, a resolve to tolerate each other for breeding purposes, a determination to live together on the principle of give and take. But once in a way a man and a woman meet whose lives are in complete accord; and such people live together for ever. True love is a union of soul and body, so close and so firmly established, that one feels that it will last as long as life lasts. It is a relationship so deep and binding, so gripping the heart by its tenderness, so transforming the life by the intensity of its fervour, that the thought of a second relationship of the same kind is a sacrilege. Śāvitrī was asked by her father to choose another husband, as the one chosen by her was fated to die early; she answered: "Be he long-lived or short-lived, endowed with good qualities or utterly lacking in them, once my husband has been chosen by me, I will not choose another." [1] Hanumān, who met Sītā, who is said to be really devamāyā born to bring about the defeat of rākṣasa māyā,[2] tells Rāma that she is pining away in Lanka, and when he met her she was resolved on death.[3] And yet Rāma, after the victory over Rāvaṇa, looks at Sītā filled with joy and love as well as a sense of shame, and tells her that it was not his love for her that made him engage in war and win victory, but the desire to protect the good name of himself and his house.[4] "I do not wish to take you back, you may go wherever you please, to Lakṣmaṇa, Bharata, Sugrīva, or Vibhīṣaṇa." [5] There are some who say that these shocking verses were a later interpolation. They indicate that the best of us are blundering amateurs in love and suffering, while women are supreme artists. When Sīta is discarded by her husband, she says, according to Kālidāsa, that "I shall, after the birth of the child, so try to practise asceticism with my eyes fixed on the Sun, that in the next life I may have you for my husband

[1] dīrghāyur adhavā'lpāyuḥ, suguṇo nirguṇo'pi vā,
sakṛd vruto mayā bhartā na dvitīyaṁ vruṇomy aham.—*M.B.*

[2] janakasya kule jātā devamāyeva nirmitā.—*Rāmāyaṇa : Bālakāṇḍa*, I. 25.

[3] martavyeti kṛtaniścayā.—*Sundarakāṇḍa*, LXV. 18.

[4] *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, CXVIII. 15-16.

[5] lakṣmaṇe vātha bharate kiṁ buddhiṁ yathāsukham
sugrīve vānarendre vā rākṣasendre vā vibhīṣaṇe
niveśaya manas sīte yathā vā sukham ātmanā.—*Yuddhakāṇḍa*, CXVIII. 20-23.

without separation." [1] Those women are the greatest lovers who grow beyond the need of any love in return, who can say to the man who deserts them: "my love no longer depends on the way you treat me." Has not Spinoza taught us that to love God without expecting any return is the highest and purest love? For normal human beings, however, love requires to be shared.

Love is not something we command. The relationship between the two persons is exclusive and no other person can enter. Infidelity destroys the nature of a person, for it attempts to undo what has been the fulfilment of one's personality. This view of marriage is a matter of culture. For there are tribes where it is a mark of hospitality to offer one's wife to a stranger, and where it is legitimate for the wife to add to the family income. But there is a general reluctance on the part of most husbands to share their wives with others: and developed cultures foster the monogamic ideal.

Marriage is the easy, but not the only, way by which we can merge our natural instinct with the spirit to form a higher union. It has for its aim human fulfilment, the development of personality through love, which is an enduring bond. We undertake married life not for the sake of natural passion, but for the sake of the spirit, ātmanastu kāmāya, for increasing the wealth of spirit, the richness of satisfaction. Under the spirit of love, our eager minds absorb impressions with new zest, all the senses thrill with keener joy, as if an unseen spirit had renewed all the colours of the earth, and inspired each living thing with a new vitality. It is possible to have love disengaged from the senses, not too much enslaved by the body, where the spirit dominates the roving animal in us. We love not the woman or the man, but the person behind; not the position, fortune or employment, not the beauty, grace or charm, but the person. Marriage is the union of two independent and equal persons, striving through mutual relationship to attain a self-development which neither could achieve in isolation. Dissimilarity is there, and we must penetrate as deeply as possible into it. "The more we understand individual things the more we understand God," says Spinoza. No man can love God perfectly if he has not loved well a creature of God in this world. There is no source of happiness so sure and true as the love of one human being for

[1] sāhaṁ tapaḥ sūryaniviṣṭadṛṣṭir ūrdhvaṁ prasūteś carituṁ yatiṣye,
bhūyo yathā me jananāntarepi tvam eva bhartā na ca viprayogaḥ.

Raghuvaṁśa, XIV. 66.

another. Through it we become wiser than we know, better than we feel, nobler than we are. The heart in its hunger and helplessness feels that it must love at any cost, if only to know that it does not exist for nothing. The way to heaven is through earthly love full of woes and watered with tears.

The great God is said to have divided himself into the twofold aspect of husband and wife.[1] Man is not a complete being without his woman. Husband and wife form one whole. The wife is ardhāngi, half-self; Mahādev and Pārvatī are represented in one body in many places in India. Love requires a blending of two essentially different, solitary individuals through physical understanding, intellectual kinship and spiritual comprehension. Man and woman are not only one flesh but one spirit; not that they are identical in tastes and outlook, but harmonious. As the spiritual end receives empirical content, marriage is said to be sacramental. We aim at the union of two persons who love each other. They are of fulfilled desire (āptakāma), and so of no desire (akāma). This deep and tender communion is the best protection against any lapse. When we are with one whom we love deeply we are satisfied, and do not ask why we live or why we were born. We know that it is for love and friendship that we are born.

Marriage and Love

There are marriages which remain at the biological level. They are cases not of love, but of sexuality or animal desire, cold and calculating. Sorrow at the death of a partner means more "regret for a lost habit than a lost person." If marriage is regarded only as a duty and convenience, it becomes a utilitarian institution of limited purpose.[2] It imposes on natural man a restraint which is felt as such, because love is not there. Even marriages which are formed by the desire for riches and position may soon develop into something richer and deeper. The pleasures of affectionate union may grow up. To be one's wife is an accident; to be in love is the reality.

There is a view which holds that there is something fatal to

[1] sa imam evatmānaṁ dvedhāpātayat tataḥ patiśca patnī ca bhavatām.
Bṛhadāraṇyaka Up., I. 4. 3.

[2] H. G. Wells observes: "Marriage has been defined as a foolish bargain in which one man provided for another man's daughter, but there is no reason why this should go so far as completing her education."

marriage in the very nature of the institution.[1] We seem to hanker after unhappiness. The forbidden fascinates us. Unorthodox love accounts for a good deal of human unhappiness—renunciation, compromise, separation, remorse and rebellion. Novels and pictures exaggerate the erotic aspects of life, which are regarded as a relief from mechanical boredom; illicit sex relationships seem to be the chief occupation of civilised peoples.

Deep love is sometimes confused with explosive passion. We think that we live more fully and intensely when we have a passionate experience, a giddiness, a cloud without discernment, without choice. It is looked upon as a transfiguring force, something beyond pleasure and pain, an ardent fever, a frenzied living, which cuts across conventions and breaks all laws in the name of something elemental and sublime. There is something tragic about such relations, which are more exhausting than helpful. When we are under the power of passion, we are not ourselves. Passion is the enemy in our own hearts that we have to contend with. It is a morbid excess, a force of nature that seizes lovers and generally ends by destroying them. Love is no paroxysm. It is inward and deep surrender and identification with the beloved. We must not equate the sublime with the trivial; the hectics of passionate love are not to be confused with deep affection.

In his *Phaedrus* and *The Symposium*, Plato speaks of a frenzy that, spreading from the body, infects the spirit with malignant humours. This sort of love he does not commend; but there is another kind of frenzy or delirium, which is neither conceived nor born in a man's soul except by the inspiration of heaven. It is alien to us, its spell is wrought from without, it is a transport, an infinite rapture away from reason and natural sense. It is called enthusiasm, which actually means "possessed by God," for the frenzy is not only of heavenly origin, but culminates at its highest in a new attainment of the divine. It is both madness and supreme sanity.

The ideal woman is the symbol of love drawing us away to the highest. We should not look upon woman as a mere means to pleasure. She is, it is true, a female; she is also a helpmate; but

[1] Seventeenth-century restoration dramatists believed that married love was a bore. Vanbrugh attributes his attitude to Sir John Brute: " What cloying meat is love—when matrimony is the sauce to it! Two years' marriage has debauched my fine senses—no boy was ever so weary of his tutor, no girl of her bib, no nun of doing penance, or old maid of being chaste, as I am of being married. Sure there's a secret curse entailed upon the very name of wife! " " The woman's well enough; she has no vice that I know of, but she's a wife, and damn a wife! "—*The Provoked Wife*, I. 1; II. 1.

she is first and foremost a human being. With a sanctity and mystery about her, she is not to be treated as a mere chattel, or maidservant or housekeeper. She has a soul, and is for man generally the bridge to reality. If we make her a mere housewife or a mother, and debase her to the service of common things, the best in her does not find expression. Every woman must have the chance, like every man, to develop the fire of passion, the transports of the heart and the flame of spirit. Tagore's Chitra exclaims: "I am Chitra. No goddess to be worshipped, nor yet the object of common pity to be brushed aside like a moth with indifference. If you deign to keep me by your side in the path of danger and daring, if you allow me to share the great duties of your life, then you will know my true self." The institution of marriage must recognise this. Happy love has no history, and we talk about it only when it is unfortunate and doomed by life itself.

There is an unformulated assumption that love and marriage are incompatible.[1] It is sometimes asked: "What does a married man know of love?" "They could not have been married, for they are so interested in each other." Marriage is not the grave of love, but only of savage love or sensuality, as Croce says. The two go together when the aim is fulfilled; but the path is long and difficult. Love is not the starting-point of marriage relationship, but an achievement to be won by effort and endurance. Failures in married life are more common among those who start with a false ideal, determined by the excitement of early love and rapturous happiness. When the novelty of marriage wears off, the excitement of fresh experiences and romantic dreams is followed by the dullness and routine of life; the romantic lover is lost in the habitual husband, and the wild exuberance settles down to domestic contentment. Marriage is not an everlasting round of roses and dreams; it is a preparation for a quiet happiness. Pleasure is of the moment, and the accidents of time and space affect it. The decay which awaits all mortal things has the power to destroy beauty of body and the fire of passion, but not the imperishable

[1] In the famous judgment delivered by a court of love in the house of the Countess of Champagne, it is said: "We declare and affirm, by the tenour of these presents, that love cannot extend its rights over two married persons. For indeed lovers grant one another all things, mutually and freely, without being impelled by any motive of necessity, whereas husband and wife are held by their duty to submit their wills to each other and to refuse each other nothing." Delivered in this year 1174, on the third day before the Kalends of May, Proclamation VII. Quoted in *Passion and Society*, by Denis de Rougement, E.T. (1940), p. 42.

element of the happiness which is the reward of austerity. What we desire is not the body, which is an illusory and fleeting aspect of the actual complete life. The fidelity of the married couple is the acceptance of one's fellow-creature, a willingness to take the other in all particularity. After a few years the early rapture and wild excitement are replaced by trusting companionship, shared work and interests, tolerance and understanding. Happiness in marriage requires a generous self-abandonment, endless tolerance and gentleness, politeness of the heart.

The idea that marriage gives a proprietary right to each other is inimical to the development of true love.[1] The very sense of security diminishes the passion. Habit deadens the perception, kills the emotions, and blinds the soul alike to satiety and to loss.

A faithful monogamous marriage is the ideal to be aimed at, though its realisation is difficult. The great romances of the world are those of faithful love. It is fidelity through suffering and pain that has moved and won the homage of the world. One of the greatest minds of the world said that "the course of true love never did run smooth," though we may settle down to it by a happy accident, if we are lucky. Marriage is an art which involves both pain and joy. The difficulties of life do not end, but begin, with marriage. It takes two to make marriage a success, but one can make it a failure. It is a partnership in which patience is called for; not an experiment, but a profound experience which, though tender and fragile at first, grows through pain and strain. Draupadī tells Satyabhāma that "happiness is not derived from happiness, but a good woman experiences happiness through suffering." [2] A woman unscarred by trouble is incomplete, for she lacks the consecration of suffering. Umā won Śiva not through her personal beauty, but through austerity and suffering. Women have a genius for suffering, and if they are not true to it, they lose their great gift of cherishing life. Kālidāsa in his *Śākuntalā* shows how two loving souls are worked through suffering into shape, and moulded into fitness for each other. The gods are strange. They bring us to trouble through what in us is good, gentle, humane and loving.

[1] sakalair nāyakaguṇaiḥ sahitas sakhī me patiḥ
sa eva yadi jārasyat saphalaṁ mama jīvitam.
The Sahajiyas believe that the intense love one should feel for God is possible only in secret forbidden love.

[2] sukhaṁ sukheneha na jātu labhyaṁ duhkhena sādhvī labhate sukhāni.
Vanaparva, 233. 4.

They send us sorrow to fit us for larger things. Centuries of tradition have made the Indian woman the most unselfish, the most self-denying, the most patient and the most dutiful woman in the world, whose pride is suffering.

Marriage is not an end in itself. It is the normal means of gaining self-fulfilment. Human relations are the most personal part of our lives, in which we can be ourselves completely. In our public life only parts of our being operate. Our personal life, which is love and fellowship, has no purpose beyond itself. It is natural for human beings to share their experience, to understand one another, to find joy and satisfaction in mutual confidence. Such relationships do not serve partial or limited ends and do not exist for society, but society and its laws exist for them. There are groupings of people, which are not personal, where the place of the individual is determined by his function in the group, by the particular service which he renders to the welfare of the whole. When we associate with others to achieve some common ends which we all share, we have functional groups and social co-operation. To avoid clashes and achieve common ends, we have to submit to rules and regulations enforced by law or maintained by custom. Since the individual is a member of society, the latter has the right to impose restrictions on the freedom of individuals. In a well-ordered society, these restrictions will not be felt as checks on individual liberty. Since marriage has consequences for society, social codes are formulated in regard to the contracting of marriages. Social laws by themselves do not constitute a universal panacea for social wrongs and evils. Man-made laws can never adjust themselves to all the caprice of the human heart. But if these are hard and inelastic, they may destroy us as individuals, and force us into mutilated and meaningless ways of living.

The Hindu Ceremony

The Hindu ideal of marriage is essentially a fellowship between a man and a woman who seek to live creatively in a partnership for the pursuit of the four great objects of life: dharma, artha, kāma, and mokṣa. Its purpose includes the generation of children, their care and nurture, and co-operation in a better social order; but its main aim is the enrichment of the personality of husband and wife, through the fulfilment of their needs for a permanent comrade-

ship, in which each may supplement the life of the other and both may achieve completeness. The married couple as persons are a mutual creation. The ideal has come down from Vedic times, and is preserved in the elaborate marriage ritual which is in force even today. The marriage ceremony marks the beginning of the great opportunity for the development of an emotional maturity, in which the sense of justice, of understanding, of consideration of, and forbearance for, others are born. It can be simplified, since the essential rites by which the ideals are impressed on the couple are only few.

The first stage is the *pāṇigrahaṇa*, where the bridegroom holds the bride by the hand and leads her thrice round the fire, reciting the appropriate verses. Oblations are offered to Pūṣaṇ, Bhaga and Āryaman, who are the presiding deities over prosperity, good luck and conjugal fidelity, respectively. The parties touch each other's heart, and pray that they may be one in heart and mind, though two in bodies. "May you never admit sorrow in your heart; may you prosper in your husband's house, blest with his life and cheerful children." They ascend a stone and offer a prayer that their mutual love be as firm and steadfast as the stone they tread on. At night the polar star and Arundhatī are shown. The bridegroom is enjoined to be as steady as the polar star, and the bride as faithful as Arundhatī. In the *saptapadi* ceremony, the bride and the bridegroom take seven steps together, and pray that their married life may be full of love, brilliance, opportunities, prosperity, bliss, progeny and holiness. The husband addresses the wife thus: "Having completed seven steps, be my companion. May I become your associate. May none interrupt my association with you. May such as are disposed to promote our happiness confirm your association with me." The husband and the wife take vows that they will further each other's hopes and desires in the spheres of religion, love and worldly prosperity.[1] The ceremony concludes with a prayer that the noble union be indissoluble. "May the universal gods join our hearts; may the waters join our hearts. May Mātariśvan, Dhātar and Dveṣtri together bind us close." [2] The woman is blessed to be a good wife with her husband

[1] Cp. the Christian formula: "I take thee to my wedded wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better for worse, for richer for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death us do part; . . . and thereto I plight thee my troth."

[2] samañjantu viśvedevāh samāpo hṛdayāni nau
saṁ mātariśvā saṁ dhātā samudveṣṭri dadhātu nau.—*Ṛg. Veda*, X. 85. 47.

alive.[1] At the end of the *saptapadi* ceremony, the bride passes into the family of the husband. Marriage may be regarded as complete with it. Others argue that consummation is necessary. For three days after the marriage, the two are to sleep in different beds, but in the same room, and practise strict celibacy.[2] This is to indicate that self-control is essential in married life. The bride and the bridegroom approach their marriage with lives that are chaste. They guard their chastity, and offer it as a tribute to the mate at the time of the marriage. No other gift can quite compensate for the loss of this.[3]

The position of the wife is an exalted one. She is to be the head of the household, bearing full sway over the father-in-law and the mother-in-law, over her husband's sisters and others.[4] She is the effective partner in life.[5] She should not be discarded in religious duties, business matters and the emotional life. All religious acts should be performed together.[6]

During the period of the banishment of Sītā, Rāma performed his rites with the golden image of Sītā by his side. Kullūka, commenting on *Manu*,[7] quotes a passage of the *Vājasaneyi Brāhmaṇa* which reads: "A man is only half his self. Till he takes a wife, he is incomplete and so not fully born. Only when he takes a

[1] avidhavā bhava varṣāṇi śataṁ sāgraṁ ca suvratā
tejasvī ca yaśasvī ca dharmapatnī pativratā.

[2] "For one year (after the day of marriage) they should not have intercourse, or for twelve nights or for six; or at least three." (samvatsaram na mithunam upeyātām dvādaśarātram, ṣaḍrātram trirātram antataḥ.)—*Pāraskara*, *Gṛhya Sūtra*, I. 8. 1.

Lycurgus, the Spartan legislator, required newly married husbands to remain continent for a considerable time.

[3] Hindu tradition insists on brahmacarya and respect for the honour of womanhood. When Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa were wandering in their quest for Sītā, Sugrīva placed before them the ornaments which were dropped as a trail by Sītā, for identification. Rāma's eyes were dimmed with tears, and so he asked Lakṣmaṇa to look at the ornaments and identify them. Lakṣmaṇa says that he cannot identify the keyuras and the kuṇḍalas as he does not know them, but he can readily recognise the nūpuras, the anklets, for he has seen them daily while prostrating at Sītā's feet.

nāhaṁ jānāmi keyūre, nāhaṁ jānāmi kuṇḍale
nūpure tvabhijānāmi nityaṁ pādābhivandanam.

[4] samrājñī svaśure bhava samrājñī svaśruvām bhava
nanāndari samrājñī bhava samrājñī adhi devruṣu.

[5] ardhaṁ bhāryā śarīrasya. ("The wife is half of one's body.")

[6] dharme ca arthe ca kāme ca anaticaritavyā
sahadharmas caritavyaḥ sahāpatyam utādayitavyam.

Vivekānanda describes how Rāmakṛṣna was willing to sacrifice his mission in life, for the sake of his duty to his wife. "I have learnt," he said to her, "to look upon every woman as Mother. This is the only idea I can have about you. But if you wish to draw me into the world, as I have been married to you, I am at your service." If Rāmakṛṣna followed the choice of his life, it was, therefore, with the consent of his wife.—*Complete Works*, Third Edition (1928), IV. 169.

[7] IX. 45.

wife is he fully born, and becomes complete." So Brāhmins versed in the Vedas declare: "Verily he who is known as the husband is also the wife." [1] The image of ardhanārīśvara is India's recognition of the mutual relationship of man and woman, the idea of the co-operative, interdependent, separately incomplete but mutually complete masculine and feminine functions. "The husband and the wife are to each other the best of friends, the essence of all relationship, the fulfilment of all desires, the very life itself. So is the husband to the wife and the wife to the husband." [2] Sītā went into exile to share her husband's sorrows. Gāndhāri refused to use her eyes lest she should enjoy a pleasure denied to her husband. The ideal wife is a source of endless gratification to the husband, with her shy tenderness, winning smile and good companionship.[3] Again, the wife who is devoted to the happiness and welfare of the husband, whose conduct is pure, who is self-controlled, attains fame here and incomparable bliss hereafter.[4] Kālidāsa makes out that husband and wife are as constantly united as are words and their meanings.[5] Sītā tells Anasūyā that her husband loved her as a father and mother would.[6] This is the vision and the ideal toward which both men and women strive.

The household is an essential element in the social structure.

[1] ardho hi eṣa ātmanaḥ; tasmāj jāyāṁ na vindate, naitāvat
prajāyate, asarvo hi tāvad bhavati. atha, yadaiva jāyāṁ
vindate atha prajāyate, tarhi sarvo bhavati. tathā ca
etad vedavido viprā vadanti yo bhartā saiva bhāryā smṛtā.—IX. 45.

[2] preyo mitraṁ bandhutā vā samagrā sarvekāmāḥ sevadhir jīvitaṁ vā / strīṇāṁ bhartā dharmadārāśca pumsām ity anyonyaṁ vatsayor jñātam astu."—*Mālatīmādhava*, VI. 18. See also *Uttararāmacarita*, VI. 39

advaitaṁ sukhaduhkhayor anuguṇaṁ sarvāsvavasthāsu yat
viśrāmo hṛdayasya yatrā jarasa yasmin na hāryo rasaḥ.

[3] Cp. kāryeṣu mantrī karaṇeṣu dāsī bhojyeṣu mātā śayaneṣu rambhā
dharmānukūlā kṣamayā dharitrī ṣādguṇyam etad dhi pativratānām.

[4] patipriyahiteyuktā svācārā samyatendriyā
iha kīrtim avāpnoti pretya cānupamaṁ sukham.

Cp. also:

pativratā patiprāṇā patyuḥ priyahiteratā
yasyasyād īdṛśī bhāryā dhanyaḥ sa puruṣo bhuvi.

[5] vāgarthā iva sampruktau vāgartha pratipattaye / jagataḥ pitarau vande pārvatīparameśvarau.—*Raghuvaṁśa*, I. 1.

[6] mātruvat pitruvat priyat. In *Rāmāyana*, Kausalyā is represented to be all that a woman could be for her husband Daśaratha.

yadā yadā hi kausalyā dāsīvacca sakhī'va ca
bhāryāvad bhaginīvacca mātruvacca upatiṣṭhate.

In *Raghuvaṁśa*, Kālidāsa says of Indumatī that she was

grihiṇi, sacivah, sakhī mithah
priyaśiṣya lalite kālāvidhau.

Varāhamihira says:

jāyā vā, janayitrī vā, sambhavaḥ strīkruto nṛuṇām
he kṛitaghnāḥ tayor nindām kurvatāṁ vaḥ kutaḥ sukham?

Through it the householder is enabled to attain liberation. Vaśiṣtha says that the life of the householder is a life of service and austerity, and is specially distinguished among the āśramas.[1] It is not the mere presence of wife and children that make a home into a home. It is the performance of social duties.[2] "The householder who is intent on God shall seek true knowledge and consecrate to God whatever work he does." [3]

Forms of Marriage

The Epics, the Smṛtis and the Dharma Śāstras mention eight forms of marriage,[4] which include relics of earlier stages that have survived into the later. Many of these can be traced to the period of the *Ṛg Veda.* Hinduism has the tendency to preserve old beliefs and customs, without deleting them when they are outworn. Four forms are approved, while the other four are disapproved.

The Paiśāca form of marriage, in which the bride is overpowered by the husband, is of a very low type. The bride is deceived, or loses control over herself by taking drugs or drink, and in such a frame of mind yields to the husband. Baudhāyana says: "When one marries a girl while she is asleep or unconscious or mad, it is the Paiśāca marriage." [5] This form is discouraged and held as low, but because certain tribes resorted to it, it was regarded as legal. Besides, in society where virginity is regarded as sacred, any woman who loses it has no chance of respectable marriage. So the jurists required the culprit to marry the woman he wronged.

The Rākṣasa form of marriage refers to a period when women were regarded as prizes of war. The victor carries away the bride and marries her. In many cases collusion of the women occurs. Rukmiṇī, Subhadrā and Vāsavadattā aided their husbands, Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna and Udayana. In the *Ṛg Veda* the Āryan masters took slave girls, but these connections were also legalised.

In the Āsura form of marriage the husband buys the bride for a

[1] gṛhasta eva yajate, gṛhastas tapyate, tapah
cāturṇām āśramānāntu gṛhastas tu viśisyate.

[2] gṛhastopi kriyāyukto nāgṛheṇa gṛhāśrami
na caiva putradāreṇa svakarma parivarjitā.

[3] brahmaniṣṭho gṛhasthas syāt tattvajñānaparāyaṇaḥ
yadyadkarma prakurvīta tad brahmaṇi samarpayet.

[4] Vaśiṣṭha and Āpastamba recognise only six forms: Brāhma, Daiva, Ārsa, Gāndharva, Kṣatra (or Rākṣasa) and Mānuṣa (āsura). Gautama and Baudhāyana add two others: Prājāpatya and Paiśāca. See also *Mahābhārata*, I. 74. 8-9.

[5] I. 11. 9.

price. It is marriage by purchase.[1] It assumes that the woman has a value, and cannot be got for nothing. This form was in practice, but was not approved. A son-in-law who buys the bride for a price is called a vijānāta.[2] These three forms of marriage are entirely disapproved.

The Gāndharva form of marriage is generally approved, as it is based on mutual consent.[3] The lover chooses the beloved. *Kāma Sūtra* regards this type of marriage as ideal.[4] No rites or ceremonies solemnise the marriage of free love. Marriages with midnight elopements, outraged parents, and other incidents of romance are brought under this class. The most interesting case of this type of marriage is that of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā, which is the theme of Kālidāsa's great drama *Abhijñāna Śākuntalā.* The poet suggests that this type of marriage, contracted under stress of passion, is not likely to be stable. As the secret union based on love at first sight is not enough, a curse falls on the bride, and exacts its penalty. In the King's court she is insulted and rejected. When she is purified by discipline, and the bondage of desire yields to the detachment of duty, Śakuntalā is accepted as wife and mother. Through the rigour of renunciation, the passion of desire has to be transmuted into the austerity of devotion. As Gāndharva unions were brought about without the recitation of mantras,[5] to give them respectability it was laid down that ceremonies should be performed after the union,[6] at any rate for the three upper classes.[7] The formal celebration is an indication of social approval. When child marriages became popular there was no scope for mutual love.

In the Ārṣa marriage, the father of the bride is permitted to accept a cow and a bull from the son-in-law. This is a modified form of Āsura marriage, and is held low among the approved forms of marriages.

In the Daiva form the sacrificer offers his daughter in marriage to the officiating priest. It is called daiva, because the marriage is settled during the course of the performance of a sacrifice to

[1] See *Ṛg Veda*, X. 27. 12.

[2] *Ṛg Veda*, I. 109. 2. *Baudhāyana* (I. ii. 20-21) condemns it. See also *Padma Purāṇa*, Brahmakāṇḍa, 24. 26.

[3] gāndharvam apyeke praśamsanti sarveṣāṁ snehānugatatvāt.—*Baudhāyana*, I. ii. 13. 7.

[4] III. 5. 30.

[5] nimantraḥ.

[6] *Devala*, quoted by Kullūka on *Manu*, VIII. 226.

[7] gāndharveṣu vivāheṣu punar vaivāhiko vidhiḥ
kartavyaś ca tribhir varṇaiḥ samayenāgnisākṣikaḥ.—*Devala*.

the gods. It is not held in high regard, since matrimonial alliances should not be mixed up with religious affairs. With the disappearance of Vedic sacrifices, this type of marriage also has disappeared.

In the Prājāpatya marriage the bride is offered to the bridegroom with due rites, and the couple are enjoined to be inseparable companions in the discharge of their religious duties. The father gives away the daughter with the injunction: "Fulfil ye the law conjointly." It does not seem to be different from the Brāhma type, where the bride, properly decorated, is offered to the bridegroom, who is specially invited for the purpose. The husband takes the vow that he will always be closely associated with the wife in all spheres of activity.[1]

Many marriages are like those of Ūrvasī and Purūrava, merely contractual, where the woman yields her body but not her soul.[2] This is abuse of sex relationship. The physical union is the outward sign of an inward spiritual grace. For spiritually evolved persons, the communion of bodies is the outward expression of the communion of souls. We must realise that sex union is the great sacrament of life. There are cases of spiritual chastity, though a woman might lose physical purity through force, or yield her body when it has ceased to have any spiritual existence for her.

The Brāhma form of marriage is the one approved and popular among all classes, and in it the couple pray that their friendship and love shall be lasting and genuine. The other types of marriages which legalise even abduction (Āsura), rape (Rākṣasa) and seduction (Gāndharva) are distorted forms of civilisation, and deprive a woman of equality by reducing her to a sexual unit, and emptying her of personality. If the codes disapprove of these, it is because they desire that marriages should not be left completely to individual choice. They were recognised in the interests of women. The Vedic seers teach that great tolerance is necessary in matters of sex, since people are endlessly different. Morality has less to do with legal ceremony, and more with mutual relations. The current forms aim at the Brāhma ideal, though here and there Gāndharva and Āsura forms are to be met with.

[1] Sambandha marriages of Malabar are like civil marriages with the right of divorce. The presentation of a cloth by the bridegroom to the bride and a social dinner constitute the whole ritual. The wife has the legal status, though she does not share the religious life of the husband. The children of such marriages take the mother's caste.

[2] *Ṛg Veda*, X. 95. 5.

Early Marriages

The custom of child marriage was unknown in the Vedic and Epic periods. Śusruta tells us that a man reaches the full development of his physical powers at twenty-five and a woman at sixteen,[1] though signs of her maturity may appear at twelve.[2] If marriages take place at any earlier age the effects will be injurious. "When a man, before he has reached the age of twenty-five, impregnates a girl less than sixteen years old, the embryo dies while in the womb. Or if a child is born at all it will not live long; and if it lives it will be weak. Therefore one should not impregnate an undeveloped girl." [3] Ancient practice was in conformity with this medical advice. The Vedic rituals assume that the bride is a grown-up woman, mature in body and mind, ready to live the married life. The word udvāha conveys the meaning that the girl is in a position to live as wife. The marriage hymn[4] assumes that the girl is blooming with youth and yearning for a husband. She is called a kanyā, who chooses a husband for herself.[5] Sītā, Kuntī and Draupadī were fully grown-up at the time of their marriages, which were consummated immediately. The *Gṛhya Sūtras* lay down that the consummation of the marriage should take place on the fourth day after the marriage ceremony. The word nāgnikā means that she is a virgin, not a tender child who has not developed a sense of modesty and bashfulness.[6] The bride and the bridegroom have to guard their chastity, and approach each other with the treasure of celibacy. Insistence on absolute chastity was responsible for pre-puberty marriages in the first centuries after Christ. The analogy of upanayana for boys was applied to marriages for girls. The joint family system encouraged non-earning members of the family also to marry. Some smṛtis argued that even if good bridegrooms were not available, girls must be given in marriage to men of inferior

[1] pañcavimśe tato varṣe pumān nāri tu ṣoḍaśe
samatvāgataviryau tau jānīyāt kuśalo bhiṣak.—35. 8.
Vāgbhata agrees with this view Cp. *Mahābhārata*. A man thirty years old is directed to marry a girl sixteen years old: trimṣaḍvarṣah ṣoḍaśābdaṁ bhāryāṁ vinded anagnikām.

[2] 14. 2. [3] X. 13.

[4] Cp. yasmāt kāmayate sarvān kāmer dhātośca bhāvini
tasmāt kanyeti suśroṇi svatantrā varavarṇinī.

[5] *Ṛg Veda*, X. 185.

[6] Hiranyakeśin and Jaimini prohibit pre-puberty marriages. They direct that the student after completing his study should marry a girl who is anagnikā, that is, not immature.

quality.[1] Marriage was obligatory for girls, though not for men. The practice, however, was originally limited to the Brāhmin class. The writers of the *Dharma śāstras*, who flourished two or three centuries before the Christian era, advise that marriages of girls should not be delayed long after puberty. They allow that girls may be kept unmarried for a period of three years, if suitable husbands cannot be found, and Manu agrees with them.[2] If, three years after attaining puberty, the guardians do not find a suitable mate for a girl, she can choose one for herself.[3] Sāvitrī remained unmarried long after puberty, and was granted permission to select for herself. She selected Satyavān, a very desirable young man in every sense, except that his horoscope indicated his death at the end of the year. Her father advised her against marriage with him; but she was firm, as she had given herself in mind to him. The marriage took place and the forecast proved incorrect. Even those who advocate early marriages (like Manu) permit girls to remain unmarried, if suitable husbands cannot be had.[4] She can live till her death at her father's home, rather than be given in marriage to an unworthy man.[5] Early and late marriages are both contemplated by the *Kāma Sūtra*.[6] Even when the girls have the right to choose their husbands, they generally consult their parents and obtain their consent. Even when brides and bridegrooms are grown-up, the usual practice is for the parents to arrange the marriages, of course in consultation with their sons and daughters. In the *Atharva Veda* we read that parents entertain suitors in their homes, and the daughters choose their husbands from them.[7] The Jātaka stories give us many examples of consultations by parents with their sons and daughters in regard to marriages. The practice of *svayamvara* (self-choice of the husband by the bride) became popular in the Epic period. Personal inclination and parental advice combine to secure for the girls worthy husbands. It is very rarely that impatient young bridegrooms are flung upon shrinking and innocent brides. After all, in a matter

[1] dadyād guṇavate kanyāṁ nāgnikāṁ brahmacāriṇe
api vā guṇahīnāya noparundhyād rajasvalām.

[2] IV. 12.

[3] IX. 90. See also *Baudhāyana*, IV. 1. 4; *Vaśiṣṭha*, XVII. 67, 68.

[4] kāmam āmaraṇāt tiṣṭet gṛhe kanyāstu matyapi
na cai vainaṁ prayacchettu guṇahīnāya karhacit.—IX. 89.

Medhātithi observes: "A maiden is not to be given in marriage before puberty, and she is not to be given even after puberty, if a good husband cannot be had." (prāg-rutoh kanyayā na dānam, ṛtudarśanepi'na dadyād yāvadguṇavān varo na prāptaḥ.)

[5] IX. 89.

[6] III. 2-4.

[7] VI. 61. 1.

where psychology, race, family traditions and education are involved, the decision cannot be left to individual caprice. Early marriages, as distinguished from child marriages, arranged by parents, in consultation with their sons and daughters, have been the norm in India. A good deal can be said in their favour. Love is predominantly a subjective experience, of which the essential components are imagination and desire. The lover is drawn irresistibly not by the real person, but by an illusory figure in his own mind. Every man bears in his heart the image of one woman, though not this or that woman. So too has woman an inborn image of man. In an early marriage, at a time when minds are receptive and malleable, the young man projects on the personality of his woman a force of attraction which has its being within himself. Even the most intelligent of us remain in ignorance of the real nature of the woman who has attracted us. Much of the cause of love is in the lover, and the object is only an accident. Whatever be the object, an almost identical passion would have been felt for it.[1] The very intensity of passion blinds us to all objective vision, and causes us to conceal the features with a veil we cannot penetrate. Any woman, no matter how commonplace and devoid of intelligence or beauty she may be, has the power to subjugate us completely, when once we have permitted ourselves to project on her all those desires and dreams which we believe can be satisfied by union with another soul. So also girls project their dreams on the husband, who is more a principle than a person. The husband or the wife is our creation; we consecrate ourselves to the service of an ideal. With acquaintance, the quality of love becomes adapted to the person loved. The instinctive desire slowly matures and adapts itself to the other person. Compatibility is a process, not an accident.

[1] Think of Dr. Johnson's reply to Boswell's question about marriage:

"Pray, Sir, do you not think that there are fifty women in the world, with any one of whom a man may be as happy as with any one woman in particular?"

"Ay, Sir," said Dr. Johnson, "fifty thousand."

"Then, Sir," said Boswell, "you are not of opinion with some who imagine that certain men and women are made for each other; and they cannot be happy if they miss their counterparts?"

"To be sure not," replied Dr. Johnson. "I believe marriage would in general be as happy and more often so, if they were all made by the Lord Chancellor, upon a due consideration of characters and circumstances, without the parties having any choice in the matter."

When Calvin was asked to marry by his friends, he expressed his readiness to consider any suitable applicant for the position and added: "I am not one of those insane lovers who rave about a woman's charms. Provided that my wife is economical, hardworking, fastidious and very attentive to my health, I shall be well satisfied."

There is a natural tendency for a boy and a girl who are brought together to grow on each other, and achieve a harmony. A popular verse says that kings, women and creepers twine themselves round those near them.[1] Women adjust themselves everywhere. They take root wherever placed.

The objection to parental leadership in marriages is due to its abuse, especially in a system which encourages early marriages for women, and remarriages for widowers. Some parents, who were eager for both making money and observing the orthodox conventions, have brought about marriages between young girls in the first bloom of their beauty and wealthy old men. All this is becoming impossible with the raising of the marriage age. The disintegration of the joint family system, the progress of women's education, the economic struggle, have brought about a gradual raising of the marriage age of boys and girls. The Śārda Act, which prescribes the minimum age for girls and boys at 14 and 18 respectively, is already the rule. For both men and women, marriageable age may be the same as the legal age for majority. In adopting post-puberty marriages, Hindu society is reverting to Vedic practice.

Choice of Partners

We have seen already that marriage is intended to be an adjustment of psychological, racial and human factors. But these are all external data which are very important, and on their basis we are called upon to develop responsible and mature love,[2] which is the destiny of the individual and the true aim of marriage. We do not marry the woman we love, but love the woman we marry. Marriage is not a matter of nice calculation. We cannot foresee how the bride and the bridegroom will each develop and also both together. Society can lay down general rules regarding the choice of partners. "The bride yearns for beauty, her mother for wealth, her father for learning, her relations for family honour, and the rest for a feast."[3] As marriage is the instrument for the perpetuation

[1] prāyena bhūmipatayaḥ pramadā latāś ca
yat pārśvato vasati tat parivesṭayanti.
Love is a matter of contiguity. Parental diplomacy believes in judicious juxtaposition.

[2] bhāvabandhanaprema. Kālidāsa.

[3] kanyā varayate rūpaṁ mātā vittaṁ pitā śrutam
bāndhavāḥ kulam icchanti miṣṭānnam itare janāḥ.
Buckle wrote that marriages had no connection with personal feelings, but were simply regulated by average earnings.

of the species, we must take into account eugenic considerations also. Since one who plants trees considers the soil and the climate, and does not permit himself to be led by caprice, marriages should become means for progressive life. We must not only perpetuate the species, but exalt it. Generally marriages should take place between members of families who belong to the same social and cultural level.[1] Excessive inbreeding is wrong, but the present laws regulating Hindu marriages are hard. They insist that marriages should be within one's own caste (endogamy), outside the direct paternal line (gotra exogamy), and also outside certain specified degrees of blood relationship (sapiṇḍa exogamy), paternal as well as maternal. Membership of the same gotra does not mean consanguinity. Such a tie may have existed at the beginning, but it has no force when we are cut off from the original founder by a number of generations. There seems to be no valid reason for the taboo on marriages between sagotras, and it may be allowed to disappear by permissive legislation to the effect that a marriage between Hindus shall not be invalid only because the parties are descended from the same gotra, notwithstanding any text of Hindu law, or custom or usage, to the contrary. The prohibition regarding the interdiction of marriages between persons by reason of sapiṇḍa relationship within certain degrees need not be taken up now. Marriages among cousins are not to be regarded as irreligious or un-Hindu. Arjuna married Subhadrā, the daughter of his maternal uncle. Kṛṣṇa married Mitravindā and Bhadrā, the two daughters of his father's sisters. Prince Siddhārtha (Gautama the Buddha) married Gopā (Yaśodharā), the daughter of his maternal uncle. *Samskāra Kaustubha* says that the great Manu, Parāśara, Angiras and Yama permit marriages among descendants of the third degree on both the mother's side and the father's side.[2] There have been violations from early times of the rules of sapiṇḍa relationship. Vaidyanātha in his *Smṛtimuktāphala* says: "among the Āndhras good people, deeply versed in the Vedas, follow the practice of mātulasutāpariṇaya, and among the Drāviḍas respectable people allow marriage of a person with a girl who is fourth in descent from a common ancestor."

It is obvious that since the end of marriage is the enhancement

[1] yayor eva samaṁ vittam, yayor eva samaṁ śrutam
tayor maitrī vivāhaś ca na tu puṣṭavipuṣṭayoh.—*M.B.*, I. 131. 10.

[2] tṛtīyaṁ mātṛtah kanyāṁ tṛtīyaṁ pitṛtas tathā
vivāhayet manuḥ prāha parāśaryo'ngirāyamaḥ.

of personality, through the development of mutual relationship based on sex attraction and affection for children, the qualities necessary for making it a success can be judged better by those who are detached, and whose emotions are not already engaged. We must be careful to marry not one who has just a pair of fine eyes and a pretty body to play with, but one who is worth while and has an attractive mind.[1]

Anuloma marriages, where men of higher castes marry women of lower, were permitted; and the children born of such marriages were placed in an intermediate caste. Rules governing the shares of inheritance of sons born of wives of different castes are mentioned in the *Dharma śāstras*. Hindu history records a large number of cases of anuloma marriages, though they were discouraged after the tenth century A.D. Pratiloma marriages, where women of higher classes marry men of the lower, were prohibited; and the children born of such marriages were not included in the four castes, but became caṇḍālas or niṣādas. As certain castes are traced to these prohibited marriages, it is clear that they were not uncommon. In the *Ṛg Veda*, however, we have many instances of intermarriages. Cultural differences among castes are gradually diminishing; intercaste marriages will again be on the increase, and cannot be said to violate the spirit of Hindu dharma. Cāṇakya says that the bride can be chosen from any caste or community, even if it is low.[2] Several inscriptions state that Hindu princes married foreign princesses.[3] Manu [4] allows a man to marry a girl, from even inferior and bad families, if the girl is a jewel among women. *Mahānirvāṇa Tantra* mentions the Śaiva form of marriage, and lays down only two conditions: that the woman is not within the prohibited degree of marriage, and that she has no husband. Questions of age and caste need not be looked into.[5] Such a rule justifies intercaste and widow marriages. Under present conditions, the Civil Marriage Act may be extended to cover marriages between two persons of different faiths, without demanding their formal renunciation of religion as at present.

[1] When a strange lady made a proposal to Bernard Shaw, "You have the greatest brain in the world, and I have the most beautiful body; so we ought to produce the most perfect child," Shaw answered: "What if the child inherits my body and your brains?"

[2] viṣād api amṛtaṁ grāhyaṁ medhyād api kāñcanam
nīcād api uttamāṁ vidyām strīratnaṁ duṣkulād api.

[3] See Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. II. Pt. I. (1941), p. 389.

[4] II. 238.

[5] vayojāti vicāro'tra śaivodvāhe na vidyate
asapiṇḍām bhartṛhīnām udvahecchambhuśāsanāt.

Polyandry and Polygamy

The wife is called patnī on account of equality of rights with the husband.[1] Dampati means that the husband and the wife are the two joint owners of the household. It follows that there can be no third. Monogamy is the ideal, and there is no double standard of morality. The examples of Śiva and Pārvatī, Rāma and Sītā, Nala and Damayantī, Satyavān and Sāvitrī were impressed on the minds of the Indian people.

Polyandry and polygamy are forbidden, and yet there are occasions when both are permitted. Polyandry prevailed in certain communities.[2] The famous instance is that of Draupadī's marriage with five brothers. Her father was aghast at the proposal, and said it was opposed to the codes (lokadharma viruddham); but Yudhiṣṭhira argues that family traditions justify it, and it is difficult to know what is right in all cases.[3] Fantastic reasons are given to justify it; and the *Tantravārttika* goes to the extent of denying it, asking us to take it only figuratively as five persons marrying one rājyalakṣmī or royal glory. The custom prevailed among the Kṣatriya tribes. Tāntrika writers, among others, protested against it. Even in Malabar communities, where it has survived, it is passing out of fashion.

As in other early societies, polygamy was the privilege of princes and noblemen.[4] Common people were ordinarily monogamous. But the *śāstras* allow a husband to contract a second marriage with the consent of his wife. It is justified, also, where the first wife is found to be imbecile or suffering from an incurable disease, or

[1] dāṁpatyo sahādhikārāt.
Cp. āmnāye smṛtitantre ca pūrvācaryaiśca sūribhiḥ
śarirārdhaṁ smṛtā bhāryā puṇyā puṇyaphale samā
yasya noparatā bhāryā dehārdhaṁ tasya jīvati
jivātyardhaśarīre tu katham anyaḥ svamāpnuyāt.

[2] Āpastamba mentions that in some communities a single woman is given in marriage to a whole family (II. 27. 3). Marriage is a contract between two families (kanya kulāya eva dīyate). Bṛhaspati refers to this ancient custom as one forbidden in the Kali age.

[3] sūkṣmo dharmo mahārāja nāsya vidmo vayaṁ gatim
pūrveṣām ānupūrveṇa yātaṁ vartmānuyāmahe.—*M.B.*, I. 210. 29.

[4] Columbus, writing on 12th October 1442 about the people of the new islands he discovered, says: "In all these islands each man is content with only one wife, except the princes or kings, who are permitted to have twenty." W. Winwood Reade says of certain tribes in Equatorial Africa: "If a man marries and his wife thinks he can afford another spouse, she pesters him to marry again, and calls him a stingy fellow if he declines to do so."

barren or adulterous. Though polygamy is becoming rarer, it is still practised. Legal recognition of polygamy has resulted in great unhappiness.[1]

The unfairness to women in *Manu* comes out when he requires a good wife to adore a bad husband.[2] This is a sort of slavery to the husband. By such exaggerated teaching he attempts to extol the duty of devotion to the husband. Of course, husbands who are unfaithful to their wives come in for severe censure. Āpastamba requires them to wear donkeys' skin and beg for food. The practice has, however, been unkind to women. There is also a difference in the treatment of widowers and widows. Men obtain permission to marry, after the wife dies, by the device that they cannot discharge their religious duties except by marrying a second time, though the presence of the wife is not indispensable for the performance of religious duties. The *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* states that a widower can continue his Vedic sacrifices, even if he has no wife. Śraddhā or devotion will function as his wife.[3] *Viṣṇu* holds that the images of the dead wife can be used. In *Rāmāyaṇa* it is said that Rāma performed his sacrifices with an image of his wife by his side. Later on, Manu and others require widowers to marry again.

The Status of Widows

The position of widows has changed considerably from the time of the *Ṛg Veda,* in which we have references to the remarriage of widows. It is undesirable for a woman to have two husbands at

[1] The late Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar observed: "The time has certainly come for the Hindu Society to discard polygamy as a rule of Hindu Law. According to early Hindu Law, monogamy was the approved rule and polygamy was an exceptional provision. . . . The right to take more than one wife in former days required legal justification; but the present rule of Hindu Law that a husband is not restricted as to the number of his wives, and may marry again without the wife's consent or any justification, is far worse. . . . In these days when equality of women must be recognized, at least in this connection, it would be folly to postpone this reform. . . . Marriages contracted between Hindus under the Special Marriage Act are monogamous, and surprisingly enough the marriages of those who are governed by the Marumakathayam Law of Malabar have become monogamous by a recent statute, while the general Hindu society still clings to polygamy."—*Madras Law Journal*, Golden Jubilee Number, 1941.

[2] viśīlah kāmavṛtto vā guṇair vā parivarjitah
upacaryah striyā sādhvyā satataṁ devavat patiḥ.—V. 154.

Cp. also:
duśśīlah kāmavṛtto vā dhanair vā parivarjitah
strīṇām āryasvabhāvānāṁ paramaṁ daivataṁ patiḥ.—*Rāmāyaṇa*, II. 117. 24.

[3] VII. 9-10.

the same time.[1] A sentiment of reluctance to marry a woman who was taken by another is at the root of the advice given by Yājña-valkya to marry a woman "that has yet belonged to no man." [2] But the Epic mentions several instances where this sentiment did not operate. Hayadratha wanted to make Draupadī his wife. Triśanku married the wife of a prince whom he killed, and had by her a son. King Ṛtuparṇa was eager to marry Damayantī at her second svayamvara, knowing her to be the wife of Nala. Satyavatī was sought in marriage by King Ugrāyudha shortly after the death of her husband. Arjuna accepted as wife the widowed daughter of Airāvata, the Nāga king, and had by her a son. The *Jātakas* also contain references to this custom. A king of Kosala killed the king of Benares and made the widowed queen, who was already a mother, his wife.[3] In the *Ucchanga Jātaka* a woman prays for the release of her brother, who along with her husband and son has been sentenced to death, saying that of these three she can get a new husband, and a new son, but not a new brother whatever she may do.[4] Kauṭilya in his *Arthaśāstra* writes: "On the death of her husband a woman wishing to lead a virtuous life shall at once receive not only her endowment, money and jewellery, but also the balance of the dowry due to her. If she is desirous of a second marriage, she shall be given, on the occasion of her marriage, whatever her father-in-law or her husband or both had given her. If a widow marries any man other than the person selected by her father-in-law, she shall forfeit whatever had been given to her by her father-in-law and her husband." [5]

In the smṛti books we find growing opposition to the remarriage of widows. Āpastamba decrees that "if a man lives with a woman who has once been married before, or belongs to a different caste, they both commit sin." [6] Apparently both intercaste and widow marriages were to be met with. Manu knows of such marriages, since he mentions that a son born of a remarried widow (paunar-

[1] *Taittirīya Saṁhitā*, VI. 6. 4; *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, III. 12. A woman calls on the Aśvins and asks: "Who brings you to bed as a widow does her brother-in-law?" (ko vam śayutram vidhaveva devaraṁ kṛṇute?). Cf. also the *Atharva Veda* : "When she who had obtained a husband gets another husband afterwards, the twain shall not be parted if they give the pañcaudana and a goat. The second husband with the rewedded wife gets to the same world when he gives the goat and pañcaudana accompanied by a good fee."—IX. 27, 28.

[2] I. 52.

[3] *Aśatarūpa Jātaka:* see also *Kunāla Jātaka*.

[4] Many instances from history are mentioned by N. K. Dutt in his article on "The Widow in Ancient India" in *Woolner Commemoration Volume*, 1940.

[5] III. 2.

[6] II. 6. 13. 4.

bhava) by a Brāhmin father does not cease to be a Brāhmin, though he is to be regarded of the same rank as a Brāhmin who lives by trade.[1] *Gautama* admits the existence of widow marriages; for he concedes the right of the son of a widow, by her second husband, to inherit one-fourth of his father's property, in the absence of legitimate heirs.[2] For *Vaśiṣṭha*[3] and *Viṣṇu*[4] the son of a married widow, by her second husband, is fourth in order of preference in the matter of inheritance among the twelve kinds of sons, and is regarded as better than an adopted son. A rigid life is prescribed for widows for a short period. "The widow of a deceased person shall sleep on the ground during six months, practising religious vows . . . then her father shall appoint her to raise issue to her deceased husband."[5] Regarding the remarriage of women, *Vaśiṣṭha* lays down very liberal rules. "If a damsel has been abducted by force, and not wedded with sacred texts, she may be lawfully given to another man; she is even like a maiden. If a damsel at the death of her husband has been merely wedded by the recitation of sacred texts, and the marriage has not been consummated, she may be married again."[6] Amitagati in his *Dharmaparīkṣā* (A.D. 1014) refers to widow marriages. "Even if a woman is married once, when through ill luck the husband dies, it is fit that she should go through the ceremony (of marriage) again, provided there has been no sex union. When the husband has gone away from home, a good wife should wait for eight years, if she has already borne a child, and for four if she has not. If, on five such occasions, husbands are taken when there is justification, the women do not incur sin. This is what Vyāsa and others say."[7] While remarriage of widows is permitted, Manu and others hold that a life of asceticism is the ideal for them.[8] Even Parāśara, who holds that remarriage of widows is legal, contends that "the woman who, when the husband is dead, observes the vow of chastity, goes to heaven after death like a Brahmacārin."[9] Later commentators

[1] III. 181. [2] XXIX. 8. [3] XVII. 18. [4] XV. 7.

[5] *Vaśiṣṭha*, XVII. 55-56; see also *Baudhāyana*, II. 2. 4. 7-9.

[6] XVII. See also *Baudhāyana*, IV. 1. 17-18.

[7] ekadā pariṇītāpi vipanne devaḥ yogataḥ
bhavitari akṣatayoniḥ strī punaḥ saṁskāram arhati
pratīkṣatā'ṣṭavarṣāni prasūta vanitāṁ sati
aprasūta ca catvāri proṣite sati bhartari
pañcasveṣu gṛhīteṣu kāraṇe sati bhartruṣu
na doṣo vidyate strīṇāṁ vyāsādīnām idaṁ vacaḥ.
See *Collected Works of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar*, Vol. II. (1928), p. 313.

[8] *Yājñavalkya*, I. 75; *Parāśara*, IV. 31 and XXXV. 14.

[9] *Manu*, V. 160.

like Hemādri, Raghunandana and Kamalākara forbid widow remarriages. In earlier times, the practice of remarriage of widows prevailed. Chandragupta II murdered his elder brother Rāmagupta and married his widow Dhruvadevī, and his son by that marriage, Kumāragupta I, succeeded him on the throne.[1] There are other instances of this kind, which did not outrage the orthodoxy of the time. Voluntary consecration to an ideal is different from its compulsory imposition. The chastity of women is praised as the highest virtue, and widows might refuse to remarry on account of their deep love for their dead husbands.

Widow remarriages became unpopular in the period between 300 B.C. and A.D. 200. Even then child widows were permitted to remarry.[2] Alberuni records that remarriage of widows was prohibited by custom, and this prohibition became extended to child widows also.

The difficulties of widows were to a certain extent relieved by the practice of niyoga, which was fairly common till 300 B.C.[3] The custom of the remarriage of a widow with the brother of the deceased husband, devara (dvitiyo varaḥ), prevailed. When the husband's dead body is about to be burnt, the dead man's brother seizes the hand of the widow with the following words: "Arise, woman, thou art lying by one whose life is gone; come to the world of the living away from thy husband, and become the wife of him who grasps thy hand and woos thee as a lover."[4] A reference to this practice is found in the *Mahābhārata*: "As a woman married her brother-in-law after the death of her husband, so, the Brāhmin having failed to protect her, the earth made the Kṣatriya her husband."[5] The son raised for the deceased husband by intercourse with the brother, or near kinsman, is called kṣetraja. The production of offspring was the main purpose, and the sanction terminated as soon as a son was born. When the widow has a son

[1] See Altekar, *A New Gupta King*, J. B. & O. R. S. (1928), pp. 222-53; also 1929, pp. 134-41.

[2] *Vaśiṣṭha*, XVII. 66; *Baudhāyana*, II. 2. 47.

[3] Cp. Martin Luther: " If a sound woman has received an unsound man in marriage, but cannot take any other man openly, and does not like to act against honour, since the Pope requires so many to witness . . . she shall say to her husband as follows: ' See well, my dear man, you have deceived me in my young body and thereby brought my honour and soul into peril, and before God there is no marriage between us. Allow me to have a secret marriage with your brother or your best friend, and you have the name so that your property shall not descend to strangers. Let yourself be willingly deceived by me, as you deceived me without my will.' "—Brian Linn, *Martin Luther* (1934), pp. 212-13.

[4] *Ṛg Veda*, X. 18. 8; see also X. 40. 2.

[5] *Śāntiparva*, 72. 12.

she gets a share of the family property. In the *Mahābhārata* Pāṇḍu and Dhṛtarāṣṭra and the five Pāṇḍavas were born of niyoga.

As the practice was inconsistent with the ideals of purity and constancy in sex relations, Āpastamba and Baudhāyana opposed it. Manu condemned the practice as animal.[1] It is one of the practices condemned in our age.[2] The practice of niyoga gradually fell out of use. Though Dayānand Sarasvati, the founder of the Ārya Samāj, sanctioned it, his followers adopted the straight course of widow remarriage.

Regarding the practice of Sati, or self-immolation, there is no direct reference to it in Vedic literature. *Gṛhya Sūtras*, which describe in great detail important ceremonies of domestic life, including the cremation ceremony, are silent about it. Later commentators and lawgivers quote a verse of the *Ṛg Veda*,[3] in support of the rite of sati. It reads: "Let these women who are not widowed, who have good husbands, applying collyrium to their eyes, enter; without tears, without disease, and full of ornaments, let these first enter the house." [4] The verse cannot be addressed to the widow, but to the assembled women; and by substituting agneh (of fire) for agre (first), its meaning becomes distorted. Possibly this custom prevailed among several branches of the Indo-Germanic race, and so among some Indo-Aryans; but it is clear that the *Ṛg Veda* viewed it with disapproval. There is Greek evidence for its prevalence in India, and *Viṣṇusmṛti* commends it. The practice prevailed among the members of the princely class. The *Mahābhārata* mentions two instances of sati. Mādrī

[1] paśudharma, IX. 66 ff.

[2] kalivarjjya. Parāśara's permission for the remarriage of widows was nullified in the name of the Kali age, when it is prohibited: so ayam punarudvāho yugāntaraviṣayah. In *Nirṇayasindhu*, III., in the chapter on *Kalivarjya*, a text is quoted:

agnihotraṁ gavālambhaṁ sannyāsaṁ palapaitṛkam
devarāc ca sutotpattih kalau pañca vivarjayet.

Perpetual sacred fire, slaughter of cows, renunciation, partaking of meat at the time of the performance of śrāddha or ancestor worship and niyoga—these five are prohibited in this Kali age. Śaṁkara lifted the ban on renunciation.

[3] X. 18. 7. See *Atharva Veda*, XII. 2. 31; *Taitirīya Āraṇyaka*, VI. 10. 2.

[4] imā nārir avidhavāh supatnir añjanena sarpiṣā saṁ viśantu / anaśravo namivāh suratnā ārohantu janayo yonim agre. We find in the *Atharva Veda* a reference to a pre-Vedic usage by which the wife was cremated with her husband.

iyaṁ nārī patilokaṁ vṛṇanā nipadyate upa tva martya pretama dharmaṁ purāṇam anupālayanti tasyai prajāṁ draviṇaṁ ca dehi.—xviii. 3. 1.

"This woman choosing her husband's world lies down by thee that art departed, O mortal, continuing the ancient practice. Give her wealth and progeny." Later a cow is substituted for the woman, who is allowed to survive and choose a mate; only he should belong to the husband's clan. See *Atharva Veda*, ix. 5. 27, 28.

immolated herself on the funeral pyre of her husband Pāṇḍu.[1] The wives of Vasudeva burnt themselves with the body of their lord.[2] Even among the princes, however, it was not the usual practice. The widows of the Kuru family duly performed the śrāddha ceremonies, after the cremation of the dead bodies of their husbands.[3] During the early centuries of the Christian era, when the Sakas and the Hunas invaded the country and created havoc, the princely families resorted to this practice to save the honour of their women. Hindu codes of conduct include practices of different ethnic groups, and their modes of living, who all aspire to adopt the Brāhminical code. In the matter of vegetarian food, and the non-marriage of widows, even the lowest classes imitate the highest. With the increase of confusion, instances of sati also increased; but all through protests were uttered. Bāṇa in his *Kādambari* declares that "this is a path followed by the illiterate, is a manifestation of infatuation, a course of ignorance, an act of foolhardiness and shortsightedness, a stumbling through stupidity, that life is put an end to, when a parent, brother, friend or husband is dead. . . . If it be properly considered, this suicide has a selfish object, because it is intended to obviate the unendurable sorrow of bereavement." Madhātithi, commentator on Manu, condemns sati as an act of suicide, not of dharma.[4] The *Ādigranth* of the Sikhs says: "They are not satis who perish in the flames, O Nānak: satis are those who live on with a broken heart." Deep love may be shaken to its depths when the lover is removed, and death may be resorted to in such cases. This is not peculiar to any race or country.[5] Thanks to the awakening of the social conscience, brought about by the spread of Western ideas, Īśvara Candra Vidyāsāgar and Rammohan Roy got the necessary legislation, in 1856, permitting widow marriages under certain conditions; it is in accordance with the spirit of Vedic tradition and practice.

[1] I. 126. 25-26.

[2] *Atharva Veda*, xvii. 7. 18-24.

[3] *Ibid.*, 27. *Strīparva.*

[4] V. 147. Cf. Bṛhaspati:

ārta ārte, mudite hṛṣṭā, proṣite malinā kṛśā / mṛte mriyeta yā patyau, sā strī jneyā pativratā.

This may be merely an exaggerated way of describing the ideal wife.

[5] When her lover was killed in the Moscow uprising of December 1917, and was buried at the "Red Funeral," the rebel lass leaped into the grave, flung herself prostrate upon the coffin that held him and cried out, "Bury me, too; what do I care about the Revolution now that he is dead?" Revolutions are nothing compared to that central stream of human life with love, parenthood and death.

Divorce

We have referred already to the provision for the remarriage of men, even when their wives are alive. The *Yajur Veda* says that one man can have many wives, but one woman cannot have many husbands. In other words, a man can have more than one wife at the same time, but a woman cannot have more than one husband at the same time, though she can have more than one husband at different times.[1] Remarriage of women is also permitted under certain conditions. "The wife of an emigrant shall wait for five years. After five years have passed she may go to seek a husband." [2] *Nārada Smṛti* says: "When the husband is lost or dead, or turned a recluse, or impotent, or fallen from caste, in these five kinds of distress, a woman can take a second husband. The Brāhmin shall wait for eight years for her husband who is gone abroad; if she has no issue she shall wait for four years; after which period she may marry another. The Kṣatriya woman, having issue, shall wait for six years, and without issue for three years. The Vaiśya woman who has issue, four years, and without issue two years. The Śūdra woman has no rule for waiting. If it be heard that the husband is alive, the waiting period shall be twice as long. Such is the order of Prajāpati." [3] If the woman is unwilling to go to her husband, when he returns after five years, she is permitted to marry a near relative.[4] While the *Dharma Sūtras* require a Brahmin woman to wait for her husband for five years, Kauṭilya reduces it for ten months.[5] Kātyāyana follows Vaśiṣṭha and Nārada and holds that "if the bridegroom be of a different caste, an outcaste, impotent, of vicious occupation, of the same gotra, a slave, a constant invalid, the bride, even if married, should be given in marriage to another." [6] The well-known verse,

> naṣṭe mṛte pravrajite klībe ca patite patau
> pañcasvāpatsu nārīṇāṁ patir anyo vidhīyate [7]

allows remarriage in certain circumstances. Kauṭilya writes: "If a husband is of bad character, or is long gone abroad, or is guilty of high treason, or is dangerous to his wife, or has become an outcast, or has lost virility, he may be abandoned by his wife." [8] He

[1] saheti yugapad bahupati niṣedho na tu samayabhedena.
[2] *Vaśiṣṭha*, xvii. [3] *Ibid.*, xii. 96. [4] *Ibid.*, xvii. 67. [5] III. 4.
[6] Quoted in Mādhava's *Parāśarabhāṣya* and *Nirṇayasindhu*.
[7] *Parāśara*, IV. 30; *Garuḍa Purāṇa*, 107. 28; *Agni Purāṇa*, 154. 5; *Nārada*, XII. 67.
[8] *Arthaśāstra*, III. 3.

gives detailed instructions for the separation of couples who find it impossible to live with each other, though he limits the privilege only to those married according to the Āsura, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa and Paiśāca forms. The permission for separation and divorce was superseded by the doctrine of the indissolubility of the marriage bond, due perhaps to the fear of the fascination of the monastic life exalted by Buddhism. Even when divorces were denied to the upper classes, others were allowed the privilege. In the pre-Christian era, divorces and remarriages took place in all sections of society. Vātsyāyana admits the remarriage of women, when he states that "union with a woman of lower caste, and a twice married woman, is neither desirable nor forbidden." [1] In other words, while marriage is sacred as a human institution, circumstances may arise in which dissolution is the only way of saving the couple from perpetual misery. For two people to remain together in unhappiness, because they have entered into a bond which only death can break, is a sin against the best in us.[2] It sometimes blasts the soul. It is better for the children that unhappy parents should not live together. Our laws make havoc of our domestic intimacies, in deference to dogmas we no longer respect. To allow divorces freely would be to damage social stability. It is a question whether increased divorce facilities in the West have added appreciably to the sum of human happiness, or at any rate diminished human unhappiness. On the sanctity of marriage depend the practice of the domestic virtues, the integrity of the family, and the rearing of children. If marriage is a sacrament, not a contract, it is not to be lightly entered upon. If we approach it in a sacramental spirit, there is a better chance of making it a success. The prevailing sentiment for centuries in Hindu society has been opposed to the remarriage of woman.

In some Hindu castes divorce and remarriage are permitted. The grounds for divorce among these are ill-treatment, continual quarrel, impotence of the husband, or any irregularities in the first marriage itself. In permitting the remarriage of widows, and the remarriage of women after divorce, we are acting in the spirit of our ancient legislators. J. D. Mayne writes: "The prohibition against second marriages of women, either after divorce or upon widowhood, has no foundation either in early Hindu law or custom.

[1] na śiṣṭo na pratiṣiddhaḥ.—*Kāma Sūtra*, I. 5. 3.

[2] Cp. Milton. "Whoso prefers matrimony or other ordinance before the good of man and the plain exigence of charity, let him profess Papist or Protestant or what he will, he is no better than a Pharisee."

The second marriage of women who have left their husbands for justifiable cause, or who have been deserted by them, or whose husbands are dead, is expressedly sanctioned by the early writers." [1]

As things are at the present day, the husband has the freedom to marry again and again, while the wife is denied the liberty to marry again, even when she is forsaken by the husband. The marriage bond cannot be regarded as indissoluble, when the husband can marry again when the wife dies, and sometimes even when she is alive. Loveless marriages and empty parodies of matrimony, which are tolerated by convention, hurt sincere spirits.[2] There are many deserted wives who have no relief. Some of them are obliged to change their religion in order to contract a new marriage. They must be allowed to remarry, if they so wish. Liberal divorce laws are not sufficient by themselves. A few unhappy situations, stinging words, resentful brooding on real or imaginary wrongs, incompatibility of temper, may all lead to separation. They may also be overcome by a little sacrifice and adjustment, which easy divorce laws do not encourage. In the early days of the Bolshevist revolution, marriage ceased to be the binding thing it was once. A simple declaration of intention to separate was all that was necessary for divorce. It was, however, open for husband and wife to stick to each other in the hope of making something out of it. A couple could be married and divorced on the same day at the same Registry office. "But the statistics of short-time marriages became so alarming that recently a new regulation was put into effect stipulating that a divorce can be granted only a certain length of time after marriage—some weeks, I believe. The charges for registration and divorce are nominal, only about five dollars." [3]

The marriage relation should be regarded normally as permanent.[4] Divorce should be resorted to only in extreme cases of

[1] *Hindu Law and Usage*, Tenth Edition, by Ś. Srinivasa Iyengar (1938), p. 185.

[2] Galsworthy observes: " Marriage without a decent chance of relief is only a sort of slave-owning. People oughtn't to own each other. Every one sees that now."—*To Let.*

[3] *Dreiser looks at Russia*, p. 165.

[4] The sacredness of marriage is taught by all the great religions of the world. " And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting him. And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you? And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away. And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept: But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife; And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."—*St. Mark* x. 2-9.

hardship, where married life is absolutely impossible. It is a drastic remedy which uproots one's whole life, involves other lives as well. We expose children to a divided life and loyalty. In the interests of the children, the marriage tie must be regarded as permanent. Conscientious parents will put up with a good deal of suffering rather than expose their children to emotional strain and nervous damage. Even when a marriage is childless, divorce is not to be freely granted. Marriage is not a mere contract; it is a part of the life of the soul. Risk and hardship are part of human life, and we must be prepared to face both. We must meet as human beings and companions full of faults, weaknesses and desires common to both; and adjustment is a long process. In the Catholic Church, the parties contracting marriage receive the Cross and the Sword on their heads bent towards each other, the one as the symbol of their tragic courageous trust in a higher order than the human, the other as the symbol of the unfailing wrath for every infraction of the law of the Cross. In the faith that love is the sign and pledge of the loveableness of the ultimate ground from which all things arise, the sacramental view requires us to face risks, and not to admit defeat in the great enterprise. We enter into the marriage relationship for the development of individual integrity, for that adaptation to reality, without which there is no happiness for individual or society. This traditional view has still a strong hold on Indians, among whom stable marriages are more numerous, and family affections much stronger, than perhaps in any other country. This is due largely to the character of Indian women, who are miracles of dignity, graciousness and peace. For many of them the object of life is to endure life. Faith in the Supreme has endowed the hearts of men and women with hope that endurance will have its reward, and suffering meekly borne will melt the stoniest heart. Divorces are much easier for men to bear than for women; for a man can throw himself into his work, and forget to a certain extent the disruption of his domestic life. For a woman it is loneliness. By casting off the chains we do not acquire wings.

The dogma of indissolubility of marriage is not final; yet it is the ideal. Deviations from it should occur only in very exceptional circumstances. Many laws and customs which were once significant and necessary have lost their meaning, and are merely empty husks. Some of them, which stifle the spirit, will have to be given up. A law establishing monogamy among Hindus is long

overdue. Such a statute can be equitable only if permissive legislation for obtaining dissolution of marriage under certain conditions is adopted. Desertion, habitual cruelty, adultery, insanity and incurable disease should be the only grounds for the dissolution of marriage, at the option of either party. Such a law will help to establish, so far as laws can do, a clean, healthy and happy life; and it will not be inconsistent with the general spirit of Hindu tradition.

Social Reform

There are anomalies in our social legislation. A Hindu with more than one wife can retain them even when he adopts Christianity, if the wives do not object, though it is a crime for the Christian to have more than one wife at a time. A Hindu, when he is converted to Islam, is governed by Muslim Law in matters of succession, unless he establishes the prevalence of a custom showing that the Muhammadan law of succession has been varied. If a Muhammadan husband gives up his faith, his marriage is dissolved. A Hindu convert to Christianity retains his wife. A Christian embracing Islam can marry another woman during the lifetime of his first wife while as a Christian he would be guilty of bigamy. A Hindu cannot divorce his wife, but can do so if he becomes a Muslim. Again, anuloma marriages were treated as legal and valid in 46 Bombay, 871 and 55 Bombay I.[1] This view is rejected by A.I.R. 1941 Madras 513. Again, section 2 of the Widow Remarriage Act (Act XV of 1856) prescribes forfeiture of the interest of the widow in her first husband's property after her remarriage. When the question was raised whether this section applies to those widows who are permitted by the custom of their caste to remarry, the Allahabad High Court held that it does not,[2] while others contend that it does. There are difficulties, too, with regard to the Hindu Women's Right to Property Act. What is needed is a codified general system of laws which is in accordance with the modern spirit of freedom and equality and applicable to the whole society. The Hindu Law Committee is attempting the codification of the law of Inheritance and Marriages.

The woman is called abala, the weak. In a civilisation where physical superiority was the determining factor, she, the weak child-bearer, had to be protected from the violence of strong men.

[1] See also 52 Madras, 160. [2] 55 Allahabad, 24.

Until recently it was admitted that women were weaker and more delicate, and so required protection; nor was it necessary for her to earn her livelihood, as the value of the work which she rendered at home was quite as important as any other type of work. So long as the home is the centre of human life, woman will continue to be the most important member of family life. But home is gradually being displaced by an hotel, a peasant cottage by a suite of rooms. We are leading a vagrant life; but the Hindu ideal is that the family should be perpetuated. Man is rooted in his soil. The Indian woman is the mother. That is the vocation for which she has yearned from childhood. There is a good deal of emphasis laid in recent times on economic independence for women. We must admit that marriage and a sheltered home are the aims of most women the world over, even today. If women become wage-earners, nothing great is likely to be gained. The tasks at home are sufficiently heavy, so that women cannot undertake other occupations without detriment to the work at home. Economic independence must be found for women within the home. Attempts should be made to give them the same rights as men have in regard to property, owning, inheritance, and disposing of property, real as well as personal. Legislation with regard to the property rights of women is urgent. The care of the destitute and the dependent, especially children, old men and women, has been the special concern of Hindu dharma. The dependent woman was a charge first on the family, and then on the clan (kula). Kauṭilya recommends workhouses for women,[1] and makes male relations responsible for their maintenance. The rights of a wife in the husband's property, movable and immovable, must be liberally admitted. The scriptures proclaim that the wife is half the husband's person, and his partner in the pursuit of the ends of life. She has a right to the dead husband's estate as long as she lives. Childless widows, according to Bṛhaspati, have a right to inherit the husband's property in preference to agnates.[2] The inheritance of the maternal grandfather's property, when he has no son, by the son of the daughter and not by her daughter, will have to be modified. That the grandson will perform oblations, which the daughter cannot, is no serious obstacle. Daughters' rights to inheritance along with the sons will have to be admitted.

Maternity must be protected, whatever be the conditions regarding

[1] II. 23. [2] See K. V. Rangaswami Ayyangar, *Rājadharma* (1941), p. 51.

marriage.[1] It is not right to penalise children for the faults of their parents. All children are legal, and equal in the eyes of the law.

In the old days, the smritikāras and their commentators, by a judicious process of selection and interpretation of ancient texts, moulded the law to suit the needs of changing times. Their place is now taken by the Courts of Law and legislative bodies. The former have not the same freedom of interpretation as ancient commentators had. So, if the growth of law is not to be arrested, legislatures have to intervene.[2]

Whatever be the origin of devadāsis, or temple girls, the system of prostitution, to which it has given rise, is vicious and requires

[1] Advertisements in Nazi Germany in which German soldiers write to German women and girls to become mothers of children by them before they leave for the front are encouraged by the State, which is interested in the increase of population, though they promote promiscuous sex-relationships.—*New Statesman*, 6th July 1940, p. 8.

[2] Bill No. 26 of 1942 deals with intestate succession and strīdhana, and No. 27 of 1942 with marriage. Under the provisions of the first Bill the widow, the son and the daughter are simultaneous heirs, the widow and the son taking an equal share, and the daughter a half of such share, whether married or unmarried, and with or without male issue. As regards a predeceased son, it is provided that this son or, in his absence, the son's son will take what the predeceased son would have inherited, if he were alive. There is a grave omission, however, of the widowed daughter-in-law, which is perhaps sought to be justified on the ground that she has been given a share in her father's estate; the daughter of a predeceased son is also left out of consideration.

Women are given full rights of ownership, including the power of disposal with regard to " property acquired by a woman by inheritance or division, or at a partition or in lieu of maintenance, or by gift from a relative or stranger before, at, or after her marriage, or by her own skill or exertions, or by purchase or by prescription, or by any other mode whatsoever."

Strīdhana is defined so as to include all kinds of property belonging to a woman; and it is provided that a daughter and her children shall succeed in the first instance. In their absence the son and his children will succeed, and in their absence the husband; thereafter, other near relations. Preference of female heirs to male ones prevailed when only males were allowed to succeed to the property of males. Now that the right of females to inheritance is sought to be recognised, the law of succession to strīdhana need be not different from the law of succession to the property of the male.

Bill No. 27 distinguishes two forms of marriage, the sacramental and the civil. In the former, both the parties must be Hindus, and neither party shall have a spouse living at the time. They must belong to the same caste but not the same gotra or pravara. They must not be sapiṇḍa of each other. If the bride has not completed her sixteenth year, her guardian, father, mother, paternal grandfather, brother, or any other agnatic male relation, or the maternal uncle, must consent to the marriage. The bridegroom should not be within the prohibited degrees. For the validity of a sacramental marriage two ceremonies are essential, invocation before the sacred fire and also saptapadi—the taking of seven steps by the couple before the sacred fire. The marriage becomes complete when the seventh step is taken. Consummation is immaterial.

For Civil marriages, one of the parties may be a Hindu, and the other a Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh or Jain. Neither party may have a spouse living. The male must have completed the age of 18, and the female her 14th year. The party, if under 21, should obtain the consent of the guardian to the marriage. Parties should not be within the prohibited degrees. The Indian Divorce Act (1869) shall apply to the marriage.

The monogamous principle is enforced in both these forms. As divorce is not allowed in the sacramental form, civil marriages are likely to be adopted more generally.

to be put down. It has been opposed by all champions of social purity, and has already been suppressed by law in Madras presidency. In the ancient civilisations of Egypt, Greece and Rome, the practice of consecrating virgins in honour of the gods prevailed. The girls lead a loose life; and it is an institution which has grown up, not merely as an accident, but as an integral part of our social codes and marriage laws. Every temple in India has, in addition to the central holy of holies (garbhagṛha), a nāṭyamandir, a dance-hall. *Śiva purāna* lays down in connection with the building of a temple dedicated to Śiva, that it should be provided with thousands of excellent girls skilled in the arts of song and dance, and numerous male musicians skilled in playing stringed instruments.[1]

There are some who argue that, in many cases, even marriage is a form of prostitution: a more fashionable form, perhaps, of disposing of a sexual commodity for monetary considerations, a form sanctified by law, custom and religion. Only the prostitute is a blackleg, who is accepting less than the market rate of wages—that is, marriage—for the service she renders. For the sake of the advantage of economic dependence, a woman gives up her work, and her person which she enjoyed, as an unmarried person. Having sold their bodies and their accomplishments for the best price they would fetch, they stick to their bargains without complaint, whatever their secret repining may be. The education which many people give to their daughters is to enable them to interest some male while her youth is still there, and to use her resources to make herself a valued member of a family. To trap a man into a contract to support her is the aim of marriage.

This is taking an unfair view of marriage; for the possibility of developing fidelity and family life are ingrained in that institution. To argue that the system of prostitution protects decent women, safeguards public health and prevents scandals, is to put a cloak on iniquity. To degrade women to satisfy men's depravity is wrong. When women are thus misused there is hardly a spark of soul left in them. Individual failings are one thing; official recognition of brutality another. Women are not to be treated as commodities. If we look upon women as persons, then prostitution is a crime against their personality.

[1] uttamastrīsahasraiś ca nṛtyageyaviśāradaiḥ
veṇuvīṇāvidagdhaiś ca puruṣair bahubhir yutam.
Vayaviya saṁhitā. Uttarakhanda, 20. 114.

Birth Control

Malthus wrote an *Essay on Population*, in which he urged that disaster would rapidly overtake the human race unless something were done to check the natural capacity of man to increase geometrically, while the produce of the soil on which he lived could at best increase arithmetically, and could do even that only for a limited time. He advised the means by which this calamity could be averted: late marriage (with absolute continence prior to marriage), followed by copulation only at such times as it was desired to have a child. Many of the assumptions made by Malthus, however, are incorrect. It is not established that over-population is the cause of poverty. It is untrue, also, that the resources of nature are unequal to the rapid increase of population.

Mahātma Gāndhi, though he is anxious to give relief to women from excessive child-bearing, feels that the use of contraceptives is dangerous to the nervous and moral health of the community. He does not wish us to adopt the old wasteful method of child-bearing, when we produce twelve of whom only half a dozen survive. For him, the means for checking too frequent births is sexual abstinence. To use contraceptives is to regard sex as an end in itself, and evade the responsibilities associated with it. We cannot regard indulgence as an end in itself. By the use of contraceptives we pervert the sex act. The end of the perpetuation of the race is frustrated, and pleasure becomes an end in itself. Clement of Alexandria says: "To have intercourse except for procreation is to do injury to Nature."

Here, as in other cases, what is ideal is different from what has to be permitted. The indissolubility of marriage is the ideal; but, in certain circumstances, divorces have to be permitted. So also control of births by abstinence is the ideal,[1] and yet the use of contraceptives cannot be altogether forbidden. It is not right to think that a man and a woman should not take physical delight in each other for its own sake, and should do so only for the sake of children.

[1] It is interesting to know that the ancient Hindu legislators require us on certain occasions to avoid sex relations. A verse is quoted by Kamalākara from Vyāsa which reads: "He should avoid intercourse with his wife when she is old, or barren or ill behaved, or when her children die or when she has not yet attained maturity, or when she gives birth to daughters only or has many sons."

(vṛddhāṁ vandhyām asadvṛttāṁ mṛtāpatyām apuṣpiṇīm
kanyāsūṁ bahuputrāṁ ca varjayen mucyate bhayāt.)

It is wrong to think that sexual desire in itself is evil, and that virtue consists in dominating and suppressing it on principle. Marriage is not only for physical reproduction, but also for spiritual development. Men and women want each other as much as they want children. To remove from the lives of masses of men and women their one pleasure would be to produce an enormous amount of physical, mental and moral suffering. Lord Dawson writes: "To limit the size of a family to, say, four children would be to impose on a married couple an amount of abstention which for long periods would almost be equivalent to celibacy; and when one remembers that, owing to economic reasons, the abstention would have to be more strict during the early years of married life, when desires are strongest, I maintain that a demand is being made which, for the mass of people, it is impossible to meet; that the endeavours to meet it would impose a strain hostile to health and happiness, and carry with them grave dangers to morals. The thing is preposterous. You might as well put water by the side of a man suffering from thirst, and tell him not to drink it. No; birth control by abstention is either ineffective or, if effective, pernicious."

It is sometimes argued that birth control is an unnatural interference with the process of Nature. But we have interfered with the process of Nature by inventions and discoveries. Our habits are different from savage practices; and this is due to our interference with Nature. If we argue that ancient things are more natural than modern, then polygamy and promiscuity should be regarded as more natural. Birth control is fast becoming, in some countries, as natural as wearing clothes, on account of the present social climate with its economic insecurity, and the desire of parents to give their children a good start in life.

The objections to the practice of birth control are due to its abuse. Women who wish to avoid the trouble of pregnancy, birth, and rearing, and men who wish to escape the responsibilities for their acts, resort to it. The abuse of a thing does not affect its proper use. If the methods of birth control are adopted by those who cannot afford to have children, we cannot condemn them. The poorer classes do not mind having children, but they do not wish to bring them up in conditions of pain and poverty. The proper remedy is that they should be provided with the means for nourishing children in a proper environment. We must improve the circumstances, not assume them to be permanent. We are not

animals. The use of sex should be governed by the mutual consent of the parties, as responsible beings. If the needs of the children require self-control, it is to be employed. If parents feel that to safeguard their mutual happiness they may risk the future, they need not be prevented from taking the risk. We do not deny that sex control is better than birth control; but men are not all saints, though they may aspire to become saints. In the present conditions, in the interests of social economy, facilities for birth control must be available, especially to the poorer classes.

Attitude to Failures

The test of a civilisation is its attitude towards the inconsistencies and foibles of human beings. Whatever rules we may adopt in regard to marriage, extramarital relations will also occur. As a rule, the Hindu sages had an immeasurable tolerance for human weakness and vulnerability. Often what is called crime is not the manifestation of a debased and brutal mind, but the expression of a sensitive and affectionate nature. Disregard of the law is not real wickedness. A good deal of current morality is unsound and conventional. Our codes have stagnated into mechanical habits by reason of flagging vitality. Convention is the general taste of the community. The morality of law or duty is not the highest type, though it is essential for social order and decency. Its inhibitions are intended to stimulate moral insight, not to break one's spirit. But life is not a mechanical observance of moral precepts. When a man and a woman are brought together in a deep unity of soul and mind, whenever he or she, looking deeply into the eyes of the other, sees mirrored there the one person before whom he or she is utterly lost in speechless adoration, wonder and love, whenever they come together in spirit before they come together in body, then everything they can do one with the other is holy. Anyone who utters a word against the sanctity of such love has not a right mind. The dictum of Augustine: 'Love God, and do what you like,' indicates that in the true life of love there is something above rules and conventions.[1] If traditional taboos and institu-

[1] Look at the great story of Abélard and Héloïse. They loved each other deeply and were parted by calamities. "Their passion had to be spent in words. Héloïse, immured in her convent, urged the lost lover to write: 'Let us not lose through negligence the only happiness which the malice of our enemies can never ravish from us. I shall read that you are my husband and you shall see me sign myself your wife.' She reminds

tionalised attitudes sometimes thwart a life of love and happiness, they may be violated. The marriage laws are intended to discipline one's nature, and bring about a harmony of physiological, racial, social, human and spiritual elements. This involves restraint and discipline. Failures may arise at any level: the physiological, the human or the spiritual. We assume that monogamy is natural. It is not quite so simple. We have passions. Fidelity, though essential, is not easy. There are some who look upon it as an absurd and cruel prejudice, the consequence of an inability to live to the full, a spiritless liking for the conventional, a contemptible timidity and lack of imagination. We sometimes think that a woman has everything she wants if she has a husband and children. She may fear to be undeceived, to be relieved of the delusion. Honourable feeling, domestic affection and a stern sense of duty that social life depends on the observance of conventions, however faulty they may be, may keep her straight; and yet there may be no full flowering of her whole nature. Her desire may be awakened, but not stilled.

him of that delicacy of passion which prompted her early refusals to marry him: 'You cannot but be entirely persuaded of this by the extreme unwillingness I showed to marry you, though I knew that the name of wife was honourable in the world and holy in religion; yet the name of your mistress had greater charms because it was more free. The bonds of matrimony, however honourable, still bear with them a necessary engagement and I was very unwilling to be necessitated to love always a man who would perhaps not always love me. I despised the name of wife that I might live happy with that of mistress.' Though wearing the habit of chastity, she could not be penitent of the past. Her tears were not for her sins but for her man. 'Remember I still love you, and yet strive to avoid loving you.' 'I have often protested that it was infinitely preferable to me to live with Abélard as his mistress than with any other as Empress of the world. I was more happy in obeying you than I should have been as lawful spouse of the king of the Earth. Riches and pomp are not the charm of love.' "—*A Treasury of the World's Great Letters*, ed. by M. Lincoln Schuster (1941), p. 37.

"Abélard replied in a conflict of love abjured and of love desired, religion commanding one way while passion preserved its dominion. The thwarted and mutilated philosopher found that piety and duty are not always the fruits of retirement from the world: 'Even in the desert, when the dews of heaven fall not on us, we love what we ought no longer to love.' He had sought in vain to arm himself against his mistress's memory by poring over St. Paul and Aristotle, and implored her not to add to his miseries by her constancy. This classic of love stories epitomises a dilemma as old as the human race. All passion spent, it ended in epistles of theology and doctrine, an escapism which should console all the lovelorn but will not."—*Times Literary Supplement*, 21st June 1941, p. 298.

Cathy says in *Wuthering Heights*: "My great miseries in this world have been Heathcliff's miseries; and I have watched and felt each from the beginning; my great thought in living is himself. If all else perished, and he remained, I should still continue to be; and if all else remained, and he were annihilated, the universe would turn to a mighty stranger: I should not seem a part of it. My love for Linton is like the foliage in the woods; time will change it, I'm well aware, as winter changes the trees. My love for Heathcliff resembles the eternal rocks beneath; a source of little visible delight, but necessary. Nelly, I am Heathcliff. He's always, always in my mind; not as a pleasure, any more than I am always a pleasure to myself, but as my own being. So don't talk of our separation again; It is impracticable. . . ."

This tension leads to the 'problem' of marriage. The tribulations of love are admitted to be beautiful, but not moral. Unless we have tolerance for breakdowns we are not sufficiently human. Socrates was more significant than Miletus, who was only a moral person. Jesus had greater goodness than the Pharisee, who was only conventionally correct. If love without marriage is illegal, marriage without love is immoral. Many aspirations are crushed and many lives destroyed on account of rigid and imperfect social rules. We attach more importance to the absolute fidelity of the body than to the unswerving loyalty of spirit. Once upon a time a young man sat by the wayside, and said to a guilty woman: "Neither do I condemn thee. Go, and sin no more." By trying to play the Puritan we often act in inhuman ways. There are two kinds of morality, the absolute one of right and the relative one of social convention, which each society construes in its own way. Through the observance of moral rules we must approximate to the ideal, which is the holy more than the moral, the beautiful more than the correct, the perfect more than the adequate, love more than law.

Even the *Rāmāyaṇa* sometimes sets a wrong ideal. Rāma refuses to take Sītā back after the fall of Rāvaṇa, because she had stayed so long in his house.[1] Sītā protests that in captivity she was no longer the master of her person. Her mind was under her control, and that was always faithful to him.[2] This harsh code was not adopted by the Smṛti writers. In *Yajur Veda* a woman is asked at a certain step in a sacrifice: Who is thy lover? (kas te jāraḥ?), and when she names her lover, that is, admits her misconduct, she is absolved from sin. Manu, while enumerating different kinds of sons, mentions one born of a lover (jāra). If women are made prisoners or molested criminally, they should be treated with sympathy and accepted after certain purificatory rites. Vaśiṣṭha holds that if a woman is taken captive by an enemy, or spirited away by robbers, or ravished against her will, she ought not to be abandoned.[3] Atri expresses

[1] rāvaṇānkaparibhraṣṭāṁ duṣṭāṁ duṣṭena cakṣuṣā
kathaṁ tvaṁ punarādadyāṁ kulaṁ vyapadiśan mahat.—VI. 118. 20.

[2] mad adhīnaṁ tu yat tan me hṛdayaṁ tvayi vartate
parādhīneṣu gātreṣu kiṁ kariṣyāmy anīśvarā.—VI. 119. 8.

[3] svayaṁ vipratipannā vā yadi va vipravāsitā
balātkāropabhuktā vā corahastagatāpi vā
na tyājyā dūṣitā nārī nāsyās tyāgo vidhīyate
puṣpakālam upāsīta ṛtukālena śuddhyati.—*Dharma Sūtra*, xxviii. 2-3; iii. 58; xxi. 8.
See also *Atharva Veda*, I. 3. 4. 2-4.

the same view.[1] Even cases of criminal assault followed by conception are taken into account, and the woman, according to Atri and Devala, is taken back into the family after childbirth, though the child is to be given up, which is unfair. After the thirteenth century practice became more rigorous, and violated women were not readmitted. Hindu society has suffered as the result of this great wrong, and paid heavily for it.

In Vedic times women who had gone astray were permitted to take part in religious service, if they confessed their error.[2] Vaśiṣṭha was willing to readmit women who had committed adultery, provided they repented and performed a penance. Parāśara holds that adulterous women should be abandoned only if they are confirmed sinners.[3] Even for adultery the man is more responsible than the woman.[4]

Past ages were filled by actual human beings, not abstractions, persons with passions in their hearts, sensitive and tender, who pass through dawning love, blind passion, ardent tenderness, doubt, apprehension, defiance, sorrow, despair, beings who abandon themselves to passion, and do not scruple to violate moral rules. Even in the *Ṛg Veda* we find references to women going astray, faithless wives,[5] elopements, lawless unions. Our Epics are full of stories like that of Viśvāmitra and Menakā, where even great heroes falter and stumble in the narrow path of conventional duty. Men much better than many of us, who have done things which we never dream of doing, are also the victims of our common frailty. Vyāsa was born of an unmarried non-Brāhmin girl, whose beauty was too much for the ascetic Parāśara. Bhīṣma was the son of an unmarried woman. Puru was the youngest son of Śarmiṣṭhā, who was a princess in attendance on the Queen, and therefore not exactly the wife of King Yayāti, and yet sage Kaṇva, according to Kālidāsa, when sending Śakuntalā to her husband's place, asks her to behave as Śarmiṣṭhā did for Yayāti.[6] We have the case of Mādhavī, who was the daughter of Yayāti She was under the guardianship of an ascetic, Gālava, who placed her under four kings in succession, on condition that each must give her up after having one son. Thus she became the mother of four sons. When

[1] V. 35; see also *Parāśara*, X. 26-7.
[2] *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II. 5. 2. 20.
[3] X. 35.
[4] tasmāt puruṣe doṣohy adhiko nātra saṁśayaḥ.—*M.B.*, xii. 58. 5.
[5] II. 29. 1; IV. 5; X. 34. 4.
[6] yayāteriva śarmiṣṭhā bhartur bahumatā bhava.

she was restored to her parents, and Gālava forced on her marriage and arranged a svayamvara, she placed the garland on a tree, indicating that she had resolved to lead the life of an ascetic in the forests. Arjuna was sought by a widowed woman Ulūpī, and had Irāvaṇ by her. The Epic *Mahābhārata* is distinctly in favour of women. Sexual wrongdoing becomes a crime or a sin by its circumstances and, after all, the sins of the flesh are not greater than those of the spirit. We must approach things human in a spirit of piety. Sexual life on its positive side is a very personal matter, guided by taste and temperament, an affair of desire and artistry. Personal conduct must be released from all taboos and restrictions, except those imposed in the interests of society, especially the weak and the young. The *Mahābhārata* had a definite social attitude towards what may be called non-marital or experimental relations between men and women. The chief objections to such relations are that they tend to promote a habit of sexual irresponsibility, or a cynical promiscuity. But we are not dealing with the promiscuous type, which cannot be changed into something different by any means. Promiscuity is a disease which has to be treated. There is no danger of sensitive men and women degenerating into promiscuous persons.

Non-marital relationships are, in very exceptional cases, perhaps the only way for some to make their sex life satisfying, precious, and even permanent. The time when men and women can be kept faithful by making it difficult for them to be unfaithful is long past. The greatest gift in our possession is our true self. Without this integrity the individual is worth nothing to anyone, not even to himself.

Adultery on the part of the husband is generally regarded as more venial than on the part of the wife. This is because men have had the run all these centuries. They cheat their wives by saying that their lapse is of no importance, it does not alter the fundamental relations, it is a passing affair, an act without a sequel. If the wife is bitter and complaining, the husband adopts the high and mighty attitude that it is vital for him, that his happiness is more important than all our petty morals. This double standard is due partly to a sense of ownership.[1] Woman is property. Adultery is an offence against property.[2] It is an illegitimate appropriation of

[1] " A man," says St. Paul, " is the image and glory of God : but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman ; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman ; but the woman for the man."—1 *Corinthians* xi. 7-9.

[2] artho hi kanyā. . . .—Kālidāsa in *Śākuntalā*.—IV.

the exclusive rights which the husband has acquired over the wife.[1] Galsworthy has written wonderfully of the Forsyte conception of woman as property. In the name of marriage we acquire vested rights in the wife's person. The woman also feels the right of property in her man. If a man commits marital infidelity he does not introduce any new blood into the family, as women's infidelity does, so the latter is regarded as more sinful. We cannot say, however, that ideas of property are at the root of all sex restrictions. Sex jealousy implies more than an infringement of one's personal property. It is a feeling of grief. There is also the idea that chastity and holiness go together.

Discipline, or the imposition of limits on our natural tendencies, is essential for human dignity. Plato in the *Philebus* says: "The goddess of the limit, my dear Philebus, seeing insolence and all manner of wickedness breaking loose from all limit in point of gratification and gluttony and greed, established a law or order of limited being; and you say this restraint was the death of pleasure; I say it was the saving of it." If we aspire to life, true, good and beautiful, we must lead disciplined lives. The overflowing violence of passion demands it. Otherwise we will justify, in the name of love, whatever is nasty, gloomy and shameful. Dirt cannot purify us. It is clear that, for normal human beings, compliance with conventional rules is the easiest way to gain the end. Only those who are well disciplined, and have developed the delicacy of apprehension which is conspicuous in the saints, have the right to go beyond the rules.

There is a notion that free love, in the wrong sense, is advocated in Russia. To give it the lie direct, it will be enough to quote what Lenin wrote to Clara Zetkin as early as 1920. "The changed attitude of young people to the problems of sex is naturally a 'question of principle' and depends on a theory. Some talk of their attitude being 'revolutionary' and 'communist.' They sincerely believe this to be the case. But this does not impress me at all. Although I am by no means an austere ascetic, this so-called 'new sexual life' of young people, and sometimes of older people also, seems to me often enough to be a merely *bourgeois* business, an extension of the bourgeois brothel. It has nothing whatever to do with freedom of love as we communists understand it. You know,

[1] Cp. *Manu*: "The seed must not be sown by any man on that which belongs to another" (IX. 42).

of course, the notorious theory that in communist society the gratification of sexual passion is . . . as simple and commonplace an act as drinking a glass of water. This 'glass of water' theory has made our young people totally and utterly crazy. It has been the doom of many a young lad and lass. Those who support it say they are Marxist. Thank you! But Marxism it is not. Things are not quite so simple as that. It is not merely something natural to us that is fulfilled in the sexual life, but also something which we have acquired through culture, however lofty or low that may be. Thirst must, of course, be satisfied. But is there a normal man in normal circumstances who would lie down in the mud and drink from a puddle? Or, say, from a tumbler the rim of which many lips have made greasy? And the fact which is of greatest importance is the social aspect of the problem. The drinking of water is an individual act. In love, on the other hand, two beings are involved. And a third, a new life, may appear. It is just here, in this fact, that the interests of society are involved. There is the duty to the community. The revolution requires concentration, an increase of strength, both from the masses and from individuals. It cannot tolerate such orgies as are normal to the heroes and heroines of d'Annunzio. Sexual licentiousness belongs to the bourgeois world. It is an evidence of decay. But the proletariat is a rising class. It has no need of intoxicants as narcotics or as stimulants. Self-control, self-discipline, is not slavery. No, even in love it is not that." [1] We must free ourselves from the illusion that primitive lusts are a novel form of advanced thought. Civilisation is man's gradual mastery over savage nature. A nation in which chastity and self-control in sexual matters are widely observed will be a strong and creative nation.[2]

There are only two ways of life: the easy and broad way of self-indulgence; the difficult and narrow way of self-restraint. The latter calls for risk, heroism, desertion and misunderstanding; but it alone is worthy of the spirit of man. Life is not meant to be easy. Its aim is not excitement or fun, but liberation of the spirit. Marriage is a means to this. India in every generation has produced millions of women who have never found fame, but whose daily existence has helped to civilise the race, and whose warmth of heart,

[1] Quoted in Klaus Mehnert, *Youth in Soviet Russia*, ed. by Davidson, p. 207.

[2] Cp. Aldous Huxley: " The cultural condition of a society rises in exact proportion as it imposes pre-nuptial and post-nuptial restraints upon sexual opportunity."—*Ends and Means*.

self-sacrificing zeal, unassuming loyalty and strength in suffering, when subjected to trials of extreme severity, are among the glories of this ancient race. Women as mothers are more directly sensible of the iniquity and injustice of the present order, and can bring about a deep and far-reaching change of spirit, and work it into the new style of life. Then will the New Man be born.

A stage will arise when even home ties are snapped for the pursuit of spiritual freedom. We transcend even social bonds by accepting them. Married life is not essential to salvation. In the moral growth of the human being, a stage arises when we overcome sex desire, develop chastity of mind and body, and identify ourselves with the well-being of the whole universe.

Lecture V

WAR AND NON-VIOLENCE

The Glorification of War—The Hindu View—The Christian View—The Illusions of War—The Ideal Society—Education in Values—Gāndhi.

The Glorification of War

LET us, in this last lecture, consider the question of the place of force or coercion in society. Mahātma Gāndhi's insistence on non-violence and the war gave to this question an urgency, and it is essential to have clear ideas as far as possible on this matter. For centuries war, which is an organised effort to kill one another, has been eulogised as a natural and wholesome concomitant of a nation's life. We are endowed with reason and intelligence, which we use to justify our actions. Wars are said to be means to good ends. Here are a few quotations which illustrate the point. Nietzsche said: "For nations that are growing weak and contemptible, war may be prescribed as a remedy, if indeed they really want to go on living." He declares: "Man shall be trained for war, and woman for the recreation of the warrior; all else is folly." "Do ye say that a good cause halloweth even war? I say to you: a good war halloweth any cause." Ruskin said: "I thought, in brief, that all great nations realised their truth and strength of thought in war, that they were nourished in war and wasted by peace, taught by war and deceived by peace; in a word, they were born in war and expired in peace." "War," said Moltke, "is an integral part of God's universe, developing man's noblest attributes." He wrote that perpetual peace was a dream, and added: "and not even a beautiful dream." "War," Bernhardi declared, "is a biological necessity, an indispensable regulator in the life of mankind, failing which there would result a course of evolution deleterious to the species and, too, utterly antagonistic to all culture. . . . Without war inferior or demoralised races would swamp healthy and vital ones, and a general decadence would be the consequence. War is one of the essential factors of morality. If circumstances require it, it is not only the right but the moral and political duty of a statesman

to bring about a war." Oswald Spengler writes: "War is the eternal form of higher human existence; states exist for the purpose of waging war." "War alone," Mussolini affirms, "brings up to the highest tension all human energy, and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it." Sir Arthur Keith in his Rectorial Address, delivered to the students of Aberdeen University in 1931, said: "Nature keeps her human orchard healthy by pruning; war is her pruning-hook. We cannot dispense with her services." There are men of all nations who have praised war as the giver of vigour, the promoter of survival, and the eliminator of weakness. It is said to develop lofty virtues like courage, honour, loyalty and chivalry.

The conscience of man has grown with the times; and today wars are not glorified but accepted with regret. While the Axis powers still cling to wars as essential factors in the growth of societies, while they believe that power is the test of a nation's greatness, that the aim of the strong is to subjugate the weak, that aggressive war is a glory, not a crime, that whatever brings victory, fraud, treachery, terrorism, inhumanity, is justified, the Allied nations proclaim that they are obliged to wage war for the sake of peace, for the sake of building a world order in which the relations of states are so regulated as to avoid periodic wars. They detest not only wars but the spirit, the temper, the cast of mind behind the Axis powers.[1] In an atmosphere of war, all the instruments of education are being devoted to the cultivation of the war spirit. Our films exhibit the activities of the instruments of slaughter: the firing of cannons, the explosion of mines and torpedoes, tanks and aeroplanes. We fight the enemy with a heart full of savage hatred, and a head fortified by scientific cunning.

Religions, however, have exalted non-violence as the supreme virtue, and acquiesced in violence on account of human imperfection. The good is never found in a pure form in this imperfect world; for its pure manifestation we must enter a world which is beyond good and evil. If the ideal has not penetrated the world as fully as we would desire, it does not follow that the ideal is to be abandoned. Absolute principles are to be related to the empirical world, which is changing and subject to human stupidity and

[1] "The question of how we can gain German power," Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf*, "is not how we can manufacture arms. It is how we can create the spirit which renders a people capable of bearing arms. Once this spirit dominates a people, it will find a thousand paths each of which leads to the necessary armament."

selfishness. We must work for changes in the social situation which will make for a more adequate realisation of the ideal. Such has been the attitude of religions on this question. I may take Hinduism and Christianity as illustrations.

The Hindu View

The Hindu scriptures look upon ahiṁsā, or non-violence, as the highest virtue. Ahiṁsā is forbearance from hiṁsā, or violence, which is the causing of pain or suffering to sentient creatures, men or animals. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* it is said that, even in yajñas or sacrifices, the gifts are moral qualities.[1] In the āśramas, or forest hermitages, a spirit of friendliness to men and animals prevailed. But we cannot say that the Hindu scriptures require us to avoid the use of force altogether. The Hindu view does not sternly uphold a distant ideal, while condemning all compromises with it. The divine is not to be found in detachment from the common life. The concrete demands of each particular situation are studied, and the principle adapted to it. A remote ideal is different from a practicable programme. An unwarranted use of force is violence. When the inmates of the hermitages were harassed by the non-Āryan tribes, they suffered without retaliating; but they expected the Kṣatriyas to protect them from the inroads of outsiders. In the *Ṛg Veda* it is said: "I string the bow of Rudra for the destruction of all who molest the Brāhmins. I fight for the protection of the pure and I pervade heaven and earth." [2] While we are asked to overcome physical evil with spiritual power, as in the conflict between Vaśiṣṭha and Viṣvāmitra, physical resistance to evil is also permitted. While all through there is emphasis on the power of the soul to overcome the enemy, resort to force is not excluded. While ascetics and hermits who have retired from the world, and so are not directly concerned with the welfare of organised societies, may not use arms in defence of individuals or groups, citizens are under an obligation to resist aggression by arms, if

[1] athayat tapo dānam ārjavam ahiṁsā satyavacanam ititā asya dakṣiṇāh.—III. 17.4. Cp. also:

ahiṁsā prathamaṁ puṣpam, puṣpaṁ indriyanigrahaḥ
sarvabhūtadayā puṣpaṁ, kṣamāpuṣpaṁ viśeṣataḥ
śānti puṣpaṁ tapaḥ puṣpaṁ, dhyānapuṣpaṁ tathaiva ca
satyam aṣṭavidhaṁ puṣpaṁ viṣṇoh prītikaraṁ bhavet.
Padmapurāṇa.

[2] I. X. 125.

necessary and possible. When a warrior, Senapati Singha, asked the Buddha whether it was wrong to wage war for the protection of their homes, the Buddha replied: "He who deserves punishment must be punished. The Tathāgata does not teach that those who go to war in a righteous cause, after having exhausted all means to preserve the peace, are blameworthy." The *Bhagavadgītā* adopts a similar view. It teaches *svadharma* to Arjuna, who is hesitant about his duty. Non-violence belongs to the last two stages of life, Vānaprastha and Saññyāsa. Arjuna, as a kṣatriya householder, cannot pursue the ideal of a saññyasin. Kṛṣṇa tried all peaceful methods of getting justice done, but having failed, he advises Arjuna to fight for the cause of justice and from a sense of duty, against the selfish and unrighteous exploiters. Kṛṣṇa returned from his unsuccessful mission of peace and said: "Duryodhana was told what was truthful, wholesome and beneficial; the fool is not amenable. I consider therefore chastisement by war, daṇḍa, the fourth expedient, as proper for those sinners; by no other means can they be curbed." Again, if one man kills another in his own interest, he is doing a wrong; if he does so for the general good he is not to blame. Besides, Arjuna's attitude was born of weakness, not of strength. He had no objection to killing as such, but only to killing his kinsmen. He is now called upon to fight without anger, fear or hatred. The opposite of love is hate, not force. There are occasions when love will use force. Love is not mere sentimentality. It can use force to restrain the evil and protect the good. Kṛṣṇa explains to Arjuna the scheme of things, and bids him take his place among the workers for world welfare. He points out that every man should play his part in the world and give his utmost. In the name of the same humanity and love for which Arjuna refused to fight, he is now called upon to take up the work of war. Non-violence is not a physical condition, but a mental attitude of love.[1] Non-violence as a mental state is different from non-resistance. It is absence of malice and hatred. Sometimes the spirit of love actually demands resistance to evil. We fight, but filled with inward peace. We must extirpate evil without becoming evil. If human welfare is the supreme good, peace and war are good only in so far as they minister to it. We cannot say that violence is evil in itself. The violence of the police aims at social

[1] Cp. *Yoga Sūtra*, II. 35:
ahiṁsā pratiṣṭhāyāṁ tat sannidhau vairatyāgaḥ.

peace. Its aim is restraint of lawlessness. Destruction is not the aim of fighting in all cases. When its aim is human welfare, when it respects personality, then war is permissible. If we say that the criminal's personality should not be violated, even when he violates the personalities of others, if we treat the gangster's life as sacred, even when he brings about the destruction of several lives more valuable than his own, we acquiesce in evil. We cannot judge the use of force, as good or bad, by looking upon it in isolation. A surgical operation inflicts pain on the patient, but can be used to save life. Whether it is the knife of a surgeon, or of a murderer, makes all the difference.[1]

In an imperfect world, where all men are not saints, force has to be used to keep the world going. In the Satya Yuga there is no need for force; but in the Kali Yuga, when men have fallen from dharma, force is essential. The king is the bearer of the rod of punishment, daṇḍadharaḥ. The recognition of the kṣatriya class indicates the justification for the employment of force. Manu and Yājnavalkya admit that dharma, or duty, sometimes requires the use of punishment. In the present conditions, the use of force is necessary to check the turbulent, protect the helpless, and keep order between man and man and group and group. But such a use of force is not by intention destructive. It works for the ultimate good of those to whom it is applied. This legitimate police action is necessary if we are to be saved from anarchy.

Hiṁsā, or violence, is different from daṇḍa, or punishment. The former causes injury to an innocent person; the latter is legal restraint of the guilty. Force is not the law-giver, but the servant of the law. Dharma, or the right, is the ruling principle, and force ministers to its decrees. The *Mahābhārata* describes the ideal of a student thus: "In the front the four Vedas; at the back the bow with arrows; on one side the spirit achieving its object through the might of spirit, on the other side military force achieving its ends"[2]; but, as the *Rāmāyaṇa* puts it, "the strength of the warrior is contemptible; only that of the sage is real strength."[3] Where non-violence is not possible, violence is permitted.[4] It is said that

[1] cikitsakaś ca duhkhānī janayan hitam āpnuyāt.—*Anuśāsanaparva*, 227. 5.
[2] brahmatejomayaṁ daṇḍam asṛjat pūrvam īśvarah.—*Manu*, VII. 14.
Again:
dharmohi daṇḍarūpeṇa brahmaṇā nirmitaḥ purā.—*Yājñavalkya*, I. 533.
[3] agrataḥ caturo vedāḥ, pruṣṭhataḥ sa śaraṁ dhanuḥ
idaṁ brāhmam idaṁ kṣātram, śāpad api śarād api.
[4] dhig balaṁ kṣatriyabalam brahmotejo balaṁ balam.

"one is free from sin in killing, confining, and inflicting pain, if they are for the welfare of the village, or from loyalty to the master, or for the sake of protecting the helpless."[1] Again: "the teacher obtains the reward of virtue by admonishing his pupils, the master by doing the same to his servants, and the ruler by punishing transgressors."[2] Manu says: "One may slay without hesitation a murderous assailant, even if he be the teacher, or an old or a young person, or even a learned Brāhmin."[3] The Vedas speak of wars and battles, and contain prayers for victory in battle and defeat of the enemies. The heroes of the Epics do not shrink from battle with the haters of the divine, asuras. Even the Brāhmins took up arms, as is clear from the examples of such Brāhmin warriors as Paraśurāma, Droṇācārya and Asvatthāma.[4] Kauṭilya actually refers to Brāhmin armies, which were distinguished for their mildness toward the prostrate enemy. The *Mahābhārata* asks: "Who is there who does not inflict violence? Even ascetics devoted to non-violence commit violence, but by great effort they reduce it to a minimum."[5] We are obliged to destroy some life in self-defence, and some in order to get food[6]; but we ought to be always regretful, not complacent about it. We must never cause death or suffering beyond what we absolutely must.

There is a contradiction between the desire for the perfect good and the need to take up partial tasks which seem to outrage the perfect ideal; yet this contradiction is the only way to carry things forward. It is the root of all human endeavour. We have to mediate between the supreme ideal of absolute non-violence and the actual conditions, where we have to further the realisation

[1] grāmārthaṁ bhartrupiṇḍārthaṁ dīnānugrahakāraṇāt
vadha bandha parikleśān kurvan pāpāt pramucyate.—*Anuśāsanaparva*, 231. 23.

[2] guruh samtarjayan śiṣyān bhartā bhṛtyajanāṁ svakān
unmārgapratipannāṁ s'ca śāstā dharmaphalaṁ labhet.—*Ibid.*, 227. 4.

[3] VIII. 350.

[4] Hindu lawgivers permit even Brāhmins to take up arms in defence of their country and dharma (*Manu*, VIII. 348), though it is mentioned in several passages that, for Brāhmins, non-violence is the highest virtue. Cp.:

ahiṁsā paramo dharmaḥ sarvaprāṇabhṛtamvara
tasmāt prānabhritassarvān na hiṁsyāt brāhmanaḥ kvacit
ahiṁsā satyavacanaṁ kṣamā ceti viniścitam
brāhmaṇasya paro dharmaḥ vedānāmdhāriṇopica.
M.B. Ādiparva, xi. 13 ff.

[5] kena hiṁsanti jīvān vai lokesmin dvijasattama
bahu sancintya iha vai nāsti kaścid ahiṁsakaḥ
ahiṁsāyāstu niratā yatayo dvijasattama
kurvanty evahi hiṁsām te yatnād alpatarā bhavet.—*Vanaparva*, 212. 32-34.

[6] sattvaih sattvāni jīvanti. ("Living beings subsist on living beings.")—*M.B.*

of the highest by means which are imperfect. These rules of dharma are relative to the conditions of society, and may conflict with the canons of absolute goodness; but without them society will become lawless and anarchic. The absolute ideal must be brought into the context of the existing social situation; and by the interaction of the two, the evolution of society is secured.

Social growth is a continually evolving creative process, demanding both fidelity to the ideal of perfect love, and sensitivity to the concrete situation in which we have to work. Perfect non-violence is undoubtedly the ideal. In a world ruled by love and justice, there will be no need for the use of force. The legislator Nārada says: "When men were habitually devoted to dharma and were always truthful, there was no vyavahāra (legal dispute), no hatred, no selfishness."[1] The saints of the world are believers in absolute non-violence. They use persuasion and passive resistance to evil. They believe in endurance, voluntary suffering, tapas. For violence breeds fear, hatred and callousness, and is possible only for the spiritually immature or perverted. The saints establish the traditions of pacific behaviour, of just dealing towards all, and of mercy towards the weak. Bhīṣma tells Yudhiṣṭhira that non-violence is the highest religion, the highest penance, the highest truth, from which all other virtues proceed.[2] Saintly souls cannot use force, for all their passions are killed; yet they are able to overpower evil. "The hard is overcome by the gentle; even the non-hard is overcome by it; there is nothing impossible for the gentle; therefore the gentle is more powerful."[3] Those who wish to live the spiritual life of perfection leave the world and

[1] *Chāndogya Up.*, V. II., where Aśvapati Kaikeya claims that he had cleared his kingdom of all thieves, drunkards, illiterate persons and debauchees:
na me steno janapade na kadaryo na madyapaḥ
nānāhitāgnir nacavidvān na svairī svairiṇī kutaḥ.

[2] ahiṁsā paramo dharmaḥ,
ahiṁsā paramaṁ tapaḥ,
ahiṁsā paramaṁ satyam,
tato dharmaḥ pravartate.
Anusaśānaparva, C. IV. 25.
See also *Ādiparva*, 115. 25.

[3] mṛdunā dāruṇaṁ hanti, mṛdunā hanty adāruṇam
nāsādhyaṁ mṛdunā kiñcit tasmāt tīkṣṇataraṁ mṛduh.

akkodhena jine kodham asādhuṁ sādhunā jine
jine kadariyaṁ dānena saccena alikavādinam.

akrodhena jayet krodham, asādhuṁ sādhunā jayet
jayet kadaryam dānena satyenālikavādinām.—*M.B.*

go into a monastery, or join a religious order. These saññyāsins are expected to be non-violent. "Regarding all with equal eye, he must be friendly to all living beings. And being devoted, he must not injure any living creature, human or animal, either in act, word or thought, and renounce all attachment."[1] The Buddha warned his disciples against hurting or causing pain to any living being. Pārśvanātha enjoined on his followers the four great vows: not to injure life, to be truthful, not to steal, and to possess no property. They do not belong to outer forms of society which have a specific function and disappear as soon as their function is fulfilled. These outer forms are accidental manifestations of the inner organisation. These saññyāsins, though they take no part in social struggles, do effectively help social growth. They are the true directors of the social movement, though they may not themselves be involved in this. They remind us of Aristotle's "motor immobilis."

The Hindu scriptures commend non-violence as the supreme duty; but they indicate occasions on which departure from this principle is permissible. We live in a society governed by certain laws, codes and customs which are not ideal, but have made compromises, which use armies, police and prisons. Even in such a society, we can live a life inspired by love to all men. While keeping the ideal before us and always striving towards it, the Hindu view recognises the relative justification of laws and institutions, because of the hardness of men's hearts. "The wise know that both dharma and adharma are mixed with injury to others." But these institutions are stepping-stones to a better order. While we need not lose ourselves in the pursuit of an impossible perfection, we must strive perpetually to eliminate imperfection, and grow towards the ideal. Progress in civilisation is to be judged by the number and character of the occasions on which exceptions to the rule are permitted. Brutal methods of teaching the young, crude punishments of offenders, are to be abolished. The ideal of ahiṁsā must be cherished by us as a precious goal, and deviations from it are to be accepted with regret. A somewhat similar view is to be found in the teaching of Jesus and his followers.

[1] *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, III. 9.

The Christian View

In the Old Testament there are two lines of thought, one pacific[1] and the other, which is the more predominant one, definitely militarist. The God of the Old Testament sanctions war and wholesale massacre. The nation was destroyed by the adoption of the militarist temper.

The teaching of Jesus is not a question to be decided by reference to statements inconsistent with the lawfulness of war, and others permitting the use of force. It is to be known from the character and example of Jesus. From this point of view, we may say that Jesus excludes all violence, and rules out war as a method of enforcing the will of nations. When Jesus quotes the Old Testament Commandment: "Thou shalt not kill," he gives to it an extended significance. He says: "Whosoever is angry with his brother is in danger of the judgment." The blindness of the militarist is the theme of a famous parable in the New Testament: "When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: But when a stronger than he shall come upon him and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils."[2]

The revolutionary implications of Jesus' revelation of God as the father of all became obscured by the practices of the races which adopted Christianity. The Sermon on the Mount is regarded as a counsel of despair, applicable, if at all, only to individuals not to states. Jesus' maxims: "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." "Resist not evil." "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword." "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence," are said to be relevant to personal relations, where magnanimity is more successful than angry retaliation. Jesus was not a legislator, and his non-resistance was meant only for a little flock in a hostile environment. Jesus does not ask us to abolish the system of public law. An organised society cannot abstain from the use of coercion. Even Christian states must suppress gangs of criminals, and defend themselves against invaders. Armed resistance is not contrary to the Gospel of Jesus. In violent language Jesus denounced the cities of Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum. He was bitter against the Scribes and

[1] See *Matthew* v. 43-45; *Luke* ix. 51-56.

[2] *Luke* xi. 21-22.

the Pharisees. He drove the money-changers from the temple with a whip. "And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all of them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves." This conduct, which is not quite consistent with Jesus' loving and tender disposition, and is inconceivable in the case of a Buddha or a Gāndhi, is used to justify the use of violence. The militarist emphasises the side of Jesus who insisted that salvation was sectarian, of the Jews, not even of the Samaritans, who called Herod "fox," cursed the fig tree, snubbed the Syrophoenician woman, and so frequently and vehemently denounced the Pharisees, even though he was their guest, as vipers, hypocrites, grafters and liars! With reference to the political upheaval which he anticipated after his death, he exhorted his followers to sell their garments and buy swords when the right moment came. "I came not to send peace but a sword." He declared that "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." He was fierce towards evil and stern to unrepentant sinners. Human life is full of conflicts and we have to choose the less of two evils. In any concrete situation we must balance good and evil, and seek the maximum possible human welfare in the circumstances. Sometimes the alternatives are a major operation or the certain death of the patient. The Christian Church advises us to use the principle of non-violence with moderation, and does not require of its followers absolute renunciation of "wealth, or of wife or of weapons."

In the early Church there were protests against war. Justin Martyr, Marcion, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius and Eusebius all denounced war as incompatible with Christianity. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 190-255) objected to war preparations, and likened the Christian poor to an "army without weapons, without war, without bloodshed, without anger and without defilement." Tertullian (A.D. 198-203) said that when Peter cut off Malchus' ear, Jesus "cursed the works of the sword for ever after." Hippolytus (A.D. 203) viewed the Roman Empire as the Fourth beast of the Apocalypse and a Satanic imitation of the Christian Church, citing, as one of its features, preparation for war. Cyprian (A.D. 257) denounced "wars scattered everywhere with the bloody horrors of camps." Even when persecuted by the strongest temporal

power, the early Church denounced the use of force. But, since the time of Theodosius the Great (A.D. 379-395), when Christianity became the State religion and was corrupted, the Church has been opposed to non-violence. Since then there have been frequent fights between the Church and the State, and the Church had no time to decide about the rights and wrongs of violence. The Christian Church in the first three centuries definitely repudiated war, yet when Christianity became established as a State religion, war entered into the Christian system, was first tolerated, and then blessed by the Church. The Thirty-Seventh Article asserts that "It is lawful for Christian men, at the command of the magistrate, to wear weapons and to serve in the wars." It does not say that it is a moral duty to assist the nation in a just war; but those who act so are acting lawfully from a Christian standpoint. The Catholics hold that the righteous are entitled to the "right of the sword" when they use it in a just cause and without regard for personal profit. St. Thomas Aquinas exhorted the clergy to encourage troops, for "it is the duty of clerics to dispose and counsel other men to engage in just wars." If today Popes and Archbishops tell us that it is a Christian duty to kill, it is only the expression of this spirit, which entered into the Christian world centuries ago. "If Jesus of Nazareth, who preaches the love of enemies, were again among us in the flesh—nowhere would he rather be incarnate than in Germany—where do you think he would be found? Do you think he would be standing in a pulpit and saying angrily: 'You sinful Germans, love your enemies'? Certainly not. Instead, he would be right in front, in the first ranks of the sword-bearers who are fighting with implacable hatred. That is where he would be, and he would bless the bleeding hands and the death-dealing weapons, would perhaps himself grasp a sword of judgment and drive the enemies of the Germans farther and farther from the frontiers of the promised land, as he once drove the Jewish merchants and usurers out of the temple," said R. H. Heygrodt in 1915.[1]

To reconcile "resist not evil" with "resist evil by force," "turn the other cheek" with "strike again," is to reconcile light with darkness, good with evil. Only this reconciliation is to be viewed as a concession to the weakness of human nature. In the age of the Reformation there is one noble protest against war. Erasmus

[1] *Thus Spake Germany*, Coole and Potter, p. 8.

writes: "nothing is more impious, more calamitous, more inveterate, more base, or in sum more unworthy of a man, not to say of a Christian, than war. It is worse than brutal; to man no wild beast is more destructive than his fellow-men. When brutes fight they fight with weapons which Nature has given them, whereas we arm ourselves for mutual slaughter with weapons which Nature never thought of. Neither do beasts break out in hostile rage for trifling causes, but either when hunger drives them to madness, or when they find themselves attacked, or when they are alarmed for the safety of their young. But we, on frivolous pretences, what tragedies do we act on the theatre of war?" "Love your enemies" insists on a right attitude to one's fellows. What is demanded is not mere non-resistance, which leaves the hate, the inner violence, the fundamental power-urge untouched, but the spirit of love. The teaching of the Cross is that we cannot redeem the world of an evil like war, unless we are prepared to endure the suffering which it involves. We must hold ourselves aloof as far as possible from the savagery and the murderous passions of the world around us, in the hope that some day there will be an opportunity for the development of a sounder principle. We must light a candle for love in a world that is mad with hate.

It is said that evil can be restrained only by force, and that in a world of strife and violence justice will perish if it is not defended. But is it for us to consider the consequence of adherence to the spirit of love? God will see to the victory of good over evil. It is our duty to apply everywhere and at all times the law of love, and not get lost over questions of expediency, practicality, prestige, honour, safety, which are all derived from fear and egotism. We cannot believe in a common Father, and acquiesce in a system that destroys masses of men with utter ruthlessness. Believers in God are bound to repudiate war, as opposed to the spirit of wisdom and love. However you may camouflage it, war is the effort of one group of men to impose its will by inflicting death and destruction on another group of men. The roots of war are in the hearts of men, in pride and fear, in envy and greed, even though these weaknesses assume national dress.

Cannot we participate in 'holy,' in 'just,' in 'defensive' wars? Jesus' answer is clear and decisive. There can be no holier cause than that of the disciples who sought to defend the Saviour from his enemies. They wished to fight, not merely for the kingdom of

this earth but for the kingdom of God, before which the highest claims of patriotism fade away. But the world is not to be saved by a resort to arms. It can be saved only by the suffering patience and sacrificial love of the Cross. No retaliation, no revenge, national or individual. We cannot say that the principle of love is to be limited to personal relations, and not extended to public and international relations. The Christian conscience is growing; and so, fifteen years ago, the archbishops and bishops at the Lambeth Conference declared war to be "incompatible with the mind of Christ." We are beginning to feel that, if we are to be regarded as civilised, we must make an attempt to eliminate wars altogether. There is such a thing as the evolution of human conscience, the growth of our sense of right and wrong.

The Illusions of War

This world has suffered much pain and cruelty from doing what we believe to be right, rather than from doing what we knew to be wrong. The pain inflicted on the world by criminals and gangsters is much less than that due to the wrongdoing of good men. Religious wars were blessed by the Church. Judicial torture was inflicted not only on criminals, but also on witnesses, as a means for extracting truth. Sweating, child-labour and slavery were recognised as equitable. Wars also are regarded by good citizens as natural and harmless institutions of civilised life. But our descendants will view with shame our social behaviour as nations, even as we view enforced sati or the slave trade, and the sooner we anticipate the views of our descendants the better will it be for humanity. We are kept in a state of barbarism in these matters by artificial means. The wicked are not the real danger, but the ordinary law-abiding, kindly, industrious citizens gone nationally mad because their ideas of right and wrong have been deliberately and systematically perverted. The more deeply an abuse is embedded in the social system, the more difficult is it to rouse men's conscience against it. The uprooting of basic ideas, of fixed mental habits with emotional associations, is a painful process. We must steadily move on to the goal of a warless world. Human nature is essentially plastic, and its future possibilities are still unexplored. Becoming better than we were, we realise that we could be better than we are. Though, in one sense, the kingdom of God will never be realised on earth,

there is another sense in which it is always being realised. The world is never left wholly without glory, though it may not be what it should be. The recognition of the evil which is present in human nature and institutions, which has set the world in flames today, is the prelude to further advance. We must develop the will for peace, and establish conditions where the adventure of war becomes unattractive. Human nature is essentially conservative, and even inert. Only the sharpest need will rouse it to action. It changes only under the impulse of inner and outer necessity; but it does change. If it did not, man would be one of the extinct species. There is nothing so plastic as the human mind. Man is still in the making and is not made.

Civilised nations are slowly beginning to recognise war as an obsolete method of obtaining decisions. The slaughter involved in modern warfare is so much out of proportion to the ends that the arguments and sentiments which have been used in the past to justify wars are no more tenable. The habit of killing and making life intolerable is said to be an inevitable element in human nature. Spengler writes: "Man is a beast of prey. I will say it again and again. All the paragons of virtue and the social moralists who want to be or get beyond this, are only beasts of prey with broken teeth who hate the others on account of the attacks which they prudently avoid." In a recent work on *Nationalism*, the authors say: "The necessity of conflict resides neither in Nationalism nor in the Nation, but in the nature of man. It seems Utopian to anticipate a period in which men will cease to organise themselves in groups for the purpose of conflict with other groups." [1] Man is not a beast of prey, who will always devour his weaker neighbours. Human beings are not like dangerous animals. Again human behaviour is largely acquired, not instinctive. It is not determined by germ cells as is the behaviour of wasps or ants. We do not grow wings or fins to cross the seas, but build aeroplanes and ships. It is this character that gives to man a superiority over the rest of creation. Man can adapt his behaviour to circumstances. Love of war is not an instinctive attitude, but an acquired mental habit. Society wills today that we should suffer and die on the battlefield, even as at other periods it willed self-immolation, or dying under the car of Jagannath. Our minds are warped by the social system. Fear of society is stronger than fear of shells. To shake it off, we must

[1] P. 335.

get out of the ruts of mental and social convention. We must change the psychological climate.

Before the domestication of animals the hunter discharged a social duty by providing food. Today the hunter is not needed for that purpose; yet hunting is fashionable, because hunting for sport has taken the place of hunting for livelihood. Even so, when we were surrounded by raiding barbarians the soldier helped to make life more tolerable; but is war essential today? Man is the only animal who kills for reasons which are more or less metaphysical, for an obsolete claim to territory, for a childish passion for a mistress, for prestige, for drawing the frontiers at one line and not another. When an institution is no longer necessary, we invent fictitious reasons for satisfying our acquired tastes which long habit has produced. War was the sport of kings and the game of the upper classes, in which the prizes were wealth and honour.[1] War has become an end in itself, an exciting game, a vested interest of financiers. Those who engage in war are not bad men who believe themselves to be doing wrong, but good men who are convinced that they are doing right. So long as power and success are worshipped, the military tradition, in its modern form of mechanical inhumanity, will flourish. We must alter our values, we must recognise that violence is an unfortunate breach of community, and devise other ways of establishing satisfactory relationships. Bernard Shaw remarks somewhere that, in a really civilised society, flogging would be impossible, because no man could be persuaded to flog another. But as it is, any decent warder will do it for a rupee, probably not because he likes it or thinks it desirable on penal grounds, but because it is expected of him. It is obedience to social expectation. The pity and the sordidness of war lie in this: that without any evil in us we engage in it, not because we are in any way cruel, but because we mean to be kind. We engage in wars to save democracy, to win freedom for the world, to guard our women and children, to protect our hearths and homes. At least we believe so.

Even as cannibalism, head-hunting, witch-burning and duels

[1] Charles Seignobos, in *The Rise of European Civilisation*, says: "War was regarded by the nobles (in the Middle Ages) not as a misfortune, but as a pleasure and even as an opportunity of obtaining wealth by pillaging an enemy's domain or taking him prisoner and holding him to ransom. A substitute for war was sometimes found by arranging in advance for a combat between the nobles of one and the same country. This was the original form of the tournament, in which both sides fought with warlike weapons, taking prisoner those whom they unhorsed and holding them to ransom."

are regarded as anti-social, war must be regarded as a monstrous evil. We must admit that moral standards apply to states also; and actions, considered evil and unsocial in an individual, cannot become right and moral when performed by the state. War, which is murder and theft committed by large numbers, however necessary it may be, is an evil.

It is argued that there are military virtues like courage and renunciation, fidelity to duty and readiness to sacrifice. The soldier's claim to greatness arises from his willing submission to the war machine. This is made possible by the imaginative presentment of war, its glories and dangers, on epic lines. War is regarded as a factor of progress and civilisation, a source of virtue and happiness.[1] In the early days, war was a relatively clean thing, a series of single-handed combats like boxing-matches. Even in the Middle Ages men adopted the military profession, and sold themselves to rival states as mercenaries for wars which did not concern them. They committed murders for states to which they owed no allegiance. But modern wars with the savage weapons of assault, with the wholesale massacres of the most helpless and the least responsible elements of the population, are the worst calamity that can afflict a nation. Women and children are in the front line. Human ingenuity has marched on from flint to steel, from steel to gunpowder, from gunpowder to poison gas and disease germs. War with its intensive character and far-reaching impact, in the modern world of machines, is a menace to civilisation. It brutalises the emotions, by both its physical violence and its incessant propaganda of bitter hatred for the enemy. It reconciles us to the use of terrorism even as a method of domestic policy. Its demoralising nature is described by great thinkers. St. Augustine asks: "What does one condemn in war? Is it the fact that it kills men who all must some day die? Faint-hearted men may blame war for this, but not religious men. What one condemns in war is the desire to harm, implacable hate, the fury of reprisals, the passion for domination." Tolstoi, in his great work *War and Peace*, writes:

[1] Cp. Treitschke: "Only a few timorous visionaries have closed their eyes to the splendour with which the Old Testament celebrates the sovereign beauty of a just and holy war. . . . A people which becomes attached to the chimerical hope of perpetual peace finishes irremediably by decaying in its proud isolation. . . . That war should ever be banished from the world is a hope not only absurd, but profoundly immoral. Imagine: it would involve the atrophy of many of the essential and sublime forces of the human soul, and would transfer the globe into a vast temple of egoism." See *Thus Spake Germany*, Coole and Potter (1941), pp. 59-60.

"The purpose of war is murder; its tools are spying, treason and the encouragement of treason, the ruin of the inhabitants, robbing them or stealing from them to supply the army, deceit and lies, called military ruses; the habits of the military profession are the absence of freedom, that is, discipline, idleness, ignorance, cruelty, debauch, drunkenness." Frederick the Great wrote to his minister Podewils: "If there is anything to gain by being honest men, we shall be honest men, and if it is necessary to cheat, we shall be cheats."[1] No one who is familiar with the general degradation of standards, with the sufferings and terrors of war, with the torment of mankind, will exaggerate its heroisms and triumphs. War, which sends millions of the world to death, which plunges myriads of homes into desolation, is a hideous evil. In it we have the concentration of all crimes. "Take my word for it," said the Duke of Wellington, "if you had seen but one day of war you would pray to Almighty God that you might never again see an hour of war." "A victory should be celebrated with the Funeral Rite," says Lao-Tse.[2]

War is said to be an inevitable evil, a calamity, a scourge sent by God, a natural disaster, earthquake or hurricane, something utterly impersonal. The appearance of barbarians is similar to an attack by a horde of locusts, or a cloud of disease germs, and we must repel the attack by the employment of force. Wars do not just occur as acts of God, or in accordance with laws of Nature; they are made by men and the training they receive. They are inevitable so long as we regard power politics as natural. If the values of justice and tolerance are to be subordinated to the power objective, then the law of the jungle cannot be superseded. If political realism means the acceptance of war as natural, we repudiate human freedom. Peace on earth is an act of faith, an act of free will against determinism.

We must fight fire with fire, say some, when the house is on fire; others hold that water, not fire, puts out conflagrations. "A weapon is silenced by a weapon.[3] If we believe in force, we cannot blame the Nazis for using it in a precise, scientific, ruthless manner, to break the human will. But can we defeat Fascism by adopting the policy of force and intimidation on which it thrives? The

[1] X. 25. Cp. Frederick the Great: "The surest means of concealing a ruler's secret ambition is for him to manifest peaceful sentiments until the favourable moment for revealing his secret designs."—*Political Testament* (1768).

[2] *The Book of Tao*, XXXI.

[3] astram astreṇa śāmyati.

tradition of civilisation, we argue, is threatened today by a new barbarism, more formidable than anything in the past, since it possesses an infinitely stronger scientific and technical equipment. This barbarism has for its chief characteristic a social mechanisation, which treats art and culture, science and philosophy, as nothing more than instruments in the struggle for power. Nothing is sacred, neither man nor woman nor child, neither home nor school nor religion. The state is organised as a mass community, and the whole militaristic system is put into action. Nazi Germany, where militarism is the leading function of a rapacious state, is the extreme logic of the doctrine of force. Lord Baldwin's classic statement, that the only defence is in offence, means that we have to kill women and children more quickly than the enemy if we wish to save ourselves. If the enemy uses poison gas, we must do the same. If he adopts conscription, we should do the same. For defeating the enemy, we must become like him. Allied nations must become machines of total war. The principles of democracy, toleration and liberty must be surrendered—temporarily, we assert. We will assume for ourselves the same kind of regime which, in our enemies, we affect to despise. We must fight evil with evil, until we are the very evil that we fight. Far from conquering our enemies, we let them make us after their own image.[1] Stalin's message to Russia indicates the extent of this danger: "It is impossible to defeat the enemy without learning to hate him with all our soul."[2] We

[1] Sir Edward Grigg: "If I am to take up arms to prove that the taking up of arms is a crime against humanity, I am surely no better than my neighbour who takes up arms merely to prove that he can use them better than I can and is therefore entitled to govern me. His object and mine, his method and mine, become precisely similar. I am to rule him by force or he is to rule me."—*The Faith of an Englishman.*

[2] Bismarck expressed the German hatred for France in the crushing statement: "The French must be left only their eyes to weep with."

In the First World War Ernst Tissaner wrote *A Hymn of Hate Against England*:

"You will hate with a lasting hate,
We will never forgo our hate,
Hate by water and hate by land,
Hate of the head and hate of the hand,
Hate of hammer and hate of the crown,
Hate of seventy millions, choking down.
We love as one, we hate as one,
We hate our foe, and one alone, England."
E.T. by Barbara Henderson.

A Hungarian folksong of the eighteenth century reads thus:

"O Magyar, think no German true
No matter how he flatter you:
For though his promises invoke
A letter bigger than your cloak

profess different aims from our enemies, but adopt identical means. We believe that we can use cold-blooded hatred for developing love, total compulsion for attaining increased freedom. It is a competition in unscrupulousness and injustice; but all this will result in an insanity of the soul for which there is no cure. Thomas Aquinas says: "even for good ends we must pursue right paths, not wrong ones."

If we invoke the spirit of hatred and bitterness for winning the war, we cannot cast them aside when we come to make the peace. It is a tragic error to argue that, though we may neglect and violate our ideals for the sake of defeating the enemy, we will have them restored when the trouble is over. If we adopt the methods of the enemy for defeating him, if, for winning victories in the field, we betray the spirit, the traditions of civilisation are betrayed. War inflames passions, heats the imagination and makes us delirious; and in the mood engendered by war no reasonable settlement is possible. The first war, though won on the battlefield, was lost in the Versailles palace. During the negotiations which preceded the Versailles Treaty, Lloyd George addressed to Clemenceau a memorandum, which is printed in his book, *The Truth about the Peace Treaties*, in which he wrote as follows: "You may strip Germany of her colonies, reduce her armaments to a mere police force and her navy to that of a fifth-rate Power; all the same, in the end, if she feels that she has been unjustly treated in the peace of 1919, she will find means of exacting retribution from her conquerors. The impression, the deep impression, made upon the human heart by four years of unexampled slaughter, will not disappear with the years upon which it has been marked by the terrible sword of the great war. The maintenance of peace will then depend upon there being no causes of exasperation constantly stirring up the spirit of patriotism, of justice or of fair play. But injustice, arrogance, displayed in the hour of triumph, will never be forgotten or forgiven." [1] The Versailles Treaty is in no small degree responsible for the later developments. In the diplomatic manœuvres which followed, the frustration and despair of some nations, the pusillanimity and fear of others, brought about tense situations, till at last the leaders of nations got excited and went

And though he add (the big poltroon!)
A seal to match the harvest moon,
You may be sure he means not well—
May Heaven blast his soul to hell."

[1] (1938), p. 405.

mad, plunging the world into flames. We may win this war; but shall we win the peace?

Again, if a dispute is settled by force, is it settled in the right way? The side which has the biggest reserves of manpower, money and munitions wins. It does not show that their cause is just, but only that their armed force is superior. War does not settle any problem, except which side is the stronger. Those who wish to be the organisers of the world master the new technique of machine civilisation, and employ it for sinister ends, disguised as civic devotion and love of freedom.

If wars become a permanent feature of international life, if we are to live in a state of perpetual preparedness and perpetual crisis, civilisation will suffer a permanent blackout. War affords no solution of human wants. On the other hand, it brings in its train unspeakable human tragedy and suffering.

It is asked, what is the alternative? An ignoble servitude, in which everything ideal and refined would be lost, and spiritual progress become impossible: a grim, bleak, inhuman life, against which the human mind recoils. War, terrible as it is, is the lesser of the two evils. It is the only way by which we can keep alive men's faith in the things of the spirit. The Greeks were right to have stood against Xerxes rather than become his helots. The Americans were right, who preferred war to remaining the servants of George III. The French Revolutionaries were right in shedding human blood to win liberties of the spirit. So are we right in denouncing Nazism. There are just wars.

But every war is represented as just by both sides in the conflict.[1]

[1] " Now may God defend you all and may God be with the right."—Neville Chamberlain (3rd March 1939). " . . . and we reverently commit our cause to God."—King George VI. (3rd September 1939).

" May God be with you."—Greenwood (for Labour " Opposition "). " With a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence. . . ."—Sir Archibald Sinclair (for the Liberal " Opposition ").

" We only wish that God Almighty, who has blessed our arms, may enlighten other nations. . . ."—Hitler (Danzig speech).

" . . . the blessing of the Almighty rests on our fight."—President Moscicki.

" May God help us in the Great ordeal which now awaits us."—Archbishop of Canterbury and other dignitaries of the Church.

" When you come to think of it, it is a great honour to be chosen by God to be His ally in so great a contest."—Canon C. Morgan Smith.

" We thank God that He gave us a speedy victory to our arms. . . . We thank Him that injustice, centuries old, has been broken down through His grace. . . ."—The German Evangelical "Opposition" in the Spiritual Council's Proclamation on the capture of Poland.

" I am certain, as sure as I sit here, that if Christ appeared today he would approve of this war."—Judge Richardson (Chairman, Newcastle Tribunal of Conscientious Objectors).

What is justice? If it is distributive justice, then an unfair or unequal allotment of possessions, opportunities, raw materials, places in the sun, and fields of economic and political influence, must be corrected. If justice is to consist in the right proportion between the importance of a nation and its possessions, what is the test of importance? Is it population, power, culture or experience in the business of government? Is there a system of law for which we fight? Do we insist that no nation should plunge the world into war until the resources of negotiation, discussion and arbitration are exhausted? Just wars are non-aggressive and liberative. They aim at defending the people against foreign invasion and attempts to enslave them. Unjust wars are wars of aggression, and aim at the seizure and enslavement of other countries. But is this distinction very clear? Issues are very complex, and our sources of information are poisoned by governments, so that it is difficult for us to decide which is a just war. Right and wrong are not so clearly divided that either side is possessed of only one or the other. At best, it is a distribution between the more just and the less just. The difference between the aggressor and the defender is not real. We need not think that our enemies are archfiends who eat their babies alive. The defenders are defending what they previously won by aggression. They are defending the *status quo*, not a new and just society. The claim of possession has no meaning except in a society of law; and the anarchical international world has no regard for law. We believe that if we crush the Germans, and the Japanese, all will be well. We need not be so optimistic or complacent. At the end of the last war, the Germans were weakened and humiliated; Germany was forced to assume the sole guilt for the world war. The German Navy was sunk to the bottom of the sea, and her army reduced to a police force of a hundred thousand men. She was disarmed under promise of general disarmament, though no other great nation in Europe had the slightest intention of disarming. Preposterous reparations were imposed, which made not only the generation involved in the war, but also their children and grandchildren, helots and slaves. In Sir Eric Geddes' words: "we squeezed Germany until the pips squeaked." Germany was encircled by a network of small states. The Saar was set up as an independent state, under the auspices of the League of Nations, the Rhineland was occupied and the Ruhr invaded. All this was done on the principle that might is right. Any proud nation that

was thus treated would have been plunged into an abyss of despair and accepted the destructive dynamic of Hitler and Nazism, which proclaims that "anything is better than the present state." Take the case of Japan, who has 465 people to the square mile, while in the U.S.A. there are 41. Japan's population is increasing annually by about a million; she is faced by a steadily lowering standard of subsistence, and the ultimate period of starvation. She is afraid. She must have raw materials, or die. She saw Russia sweeping down on China from the north and the west; France had an Empire in the south of China, and Britain a large sphere of influence in the Yangtze valley. The Japanese are not savage devils, but normal people who are afraid that they must do what they are doing, or die. We detest the German persecution of the Jews; but the U.S.A. refused to put the Japanese on the quota. The Exclusion Act is there, causing resentment in millions of hearts. The Nazis, who are adopting a programme of racial discrimination, borrowed a large part of their technique from some of the Allied nations. Mr. Lloyd George asks us not to judge the authors of the Versailles settlement by "the subsequent abuse of its provisions and powers by some of the nations who dictated its terms. The merits of a law cannot be determined by a fraudulent interpretation of its clauses by those who are in a position temporarily to abuse legal rights and to evade honourable obligations. It is not the Treaties that should be blamed. The fault lies with those who repudiated their own solemn contracts and pledges by taking a discreditable advantage of their temporary superiority to deny justice to those who, for the time being, were helpless to exact it." [1] When the Germans concluded an armistice on the basis of Wilson's Fourteen Points, the way in which they were treated by the victorious powers is thus related by Mr. Lloyd George: "The Germans had accepted our Armistice conditions, which were sufficiently severe, and they had complied with the majority of those conditions. But, so far, not a single ton of food had been sent into Germany. The fishing fleet had even been prevented from going out to catch a few herrings. The Allies were now on top, but the memory of starvation might one day turn against them. The Germans were being allowed to starve whilst at the same time hundreds of thousands of tons of food were lying at Rotterdam, waiting to be taken up the waterways into Germany. The Allies

[1] *The Truth about the Peace Treaties* (1938), p. 6.

were sowing hatred for the future, they were piling up agony, not for the Germans, but for themselves." [1] So long as the present ideals operate, the play will continue the same in the theatre of war; only the actors will change.

But can we always engage in wars, even if we know that our cause is just? The only decent motive for war is the prevention of injustice. For its sake, we accept war as the lesser of two evils. If there are no reasonable prospects of winning, any military resistance will increase the evil, not diminish it. We must give up faith in force, and judge our cause by the strength of the force behind it.

There is something more horrible than war: the killing of the spirit within the body. A Nazi world might possess a higher degree of unity than it has ever possessed in the past; but it would be a soulless unity, like the societies of the insect world. The distinctive human values of wisdom and love, the free use of intelligence and individual responsibility, will be spurned; the blind sociability of the gregarious animal, superstition, and the cult of race, will be exalted. In spite of all their inadequacies, the Allied nations stand up for human contentment and freedom, for social peace, and for justice to the disinherited of the world. There is, however, a strong feeling among millions of the world's population that both sides stand rooted in old ways, and will evade justice to the depressed. They are both fighting for the defence or acquisition of possessions, and are ready to accept the horrors of war for safeguarding their interests.

Our whole conception of the state requires alteration. Power and force are not the ultimate realities in human society. A state is a group or association of persons inhabiting a certain defined territory, with a common government. When a certain state is said to be more powerful than another, all that is meant is that its inhabitants, on account of certain advantages, numbers, strategical position, control of raw materials, or development of agriculture and industry, or arms, are in a position to compel inhabitants of other

[1] *The Truth about the Peace Treaties* (1938), pp. 294-5. Count von Brockdorff Rantzau, who spoke on behalf of the German Delegation when the terms of the Treaty were presented, referring to the atrocities of the war, said: "Crimes in war may not be excusable, but they are committed in the struggle for victory, in anxiety to preserve national existence, in a heat of passion which blunts the conscience of nations. The hundreds of thousands of non-combatants who have perished since the 11th of November through the blockade were killed with cold deliberation, after victory had been won and assured to our adversaries. Think of that when you speak of guilt and atonement" (p. 679).

areas by force to do what they wish them to do. In early days, the physically stronger individual exercised control over the weaker, even as powerful states control weaker ones. Is this in principle different from the husband who beats his wife, from a dacoit who holds up someone at a street corner and robs him of his purse, or an employer who breaks a strike? This faith in force is a disease that has twisted and tortured the world. It deprives us of our manhood.[1] A world in which the unspeakable fiendishness of war is possible is not worth saving. We must get rid of the social order, the nightmare world which is maintained by loudspeakers, flood-lighting and recurrent wars. War sets up a vicious circle, a dictated peace with revenge, resentment and thirst for revenge on the part of the vanquished, and war again. Humility becomes us all. A new technique, a revolutionary one, has to be adopted. About the feud between the houses of Capulet and Montague, Mercutio, slain in the duel, in the insight of the dying moment, cries: "A plague o' both your houses." That bitter feud of one house against the other was cut across by a love that broke the vicious circle of its hate. In that final moment of the play Capulet says: "O brother Montague, give me thy hand."

The Ideal Society

The ideal for which we work must be better than the actual state of affairs, and yet not remote from the conditions of human life. The world cannot be suddenly transmuted into obedience to the law of love. We say that our enemies are fighting to dominate, and we to liberate, a new age. We are fighting not merely for freeing the world from the yoke of Nazism, but for creating the positive conditions in which the different peoples can affirm their own essence, and make their specific contributions. The war is the death-agony of the habits of thought and system of exploitation which we have pursued all these centuries. Hitler is an effect, a symptom, not a cause. He is no accident, but the natural, inevitable outcome of the present order. To avert Hitlerism we must resolve

[1] In a sermon preached at the Riverside Church, on 19th February 1939, Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick said: " In this regard how like we human beings are to dogs. For one dog barks and the other barks back, and the first barks more loudly and the second becomes more noisily still, in a mounting crescendo of hostility. So one man excused his terrier to the exasperated owner of another. ' After all,' he said, ' the dog is only human.' "

that all men, irrespective of race, creed or colour, shall have the basic opportunity to work and earn a living wage; that education, wealth, decent shelter and civil liberties shall be available to all. The glaring contradictions of an economy which is forced to destroy food while people starve,[1] which supports an incredible luxury side by side with an unbearable squalor, must be ended. Domination is the product of insecurity in the face of difference. If there are no strong people to oppress the weak, there will be no room for coercion.

Whatever the causes, religious, psychological, economic or organisational, only pressure on governments can prevent them from fighting one another. Unofficial bodies cannot take action against governments in moments of crisis, for that would mean rebellion. We must build up institutions through which we can develop the habits of goodness and peace.

Those who go to war are not criminals, but men who nourish real grievances. They reply to our injustice by violent injustices of their own. Instead of getting angry, we must try to discover and remove the motives of their crimes. We must recognise that there is something deeply wrong in the present world. We must effect peacefully a social transformation which makes justice, individual and national, its objective.

The withering away of the state means the displacement of coercion by habit, discussion and argument, the building up of a system of law, liberty and peace. As we have, for the lawless violence of the robber or murderer, a legal application of force, we must have it also for the wanton aggression on a peaceful neighbour. Lathi charges and gunshots are not very pleasant; but they are better than mob-violence and incendiarism. In principle, we are against the use of this amount of force to suppress lawlessness, in the sense that we regret the necessity to use it; yet it is a regrettable necessity. For if we allow wanton aggression to rage and spread unchecked we increase the total amount of evil. It is the duty of the state to prevent effectively the lawless use of force, though we must not use more force than is necessary. It must be sufficient;

[1] Sir John Orr observes: "A third of the population in the United Kingdom and about an equal proportion in the United States do not enjoy food and shelter on the standard needed for health. In most other countries, the proportion of the population which has never been adequately fed or adequately housed is even higher. Among the native races, for whose welfare Britain is responsible, only a relatively small proportion of the population have houses in which they can live in decency and food on the health standard."—*Fighting for What?*, 1942.

otherwise lawless force will become triumphant. National life was a chaos of private feuds, as international life is today. Order and liberty in national life were secured by the legal use of force and education. A similar method will have to be adopted in international matters also. In any imperfect society, law backed by force exists to enable the very large majority of good men to live among a few bad men. Unarmed idealism cannot subdue evil. Pascal said: "Justice without force is powerless."[1] So long as there are men inclined to ignore justice, justice shall have power. We are like ships that are more likely to reach their port if they compromise a little with wind and weather. Force, when used by an international authority, is not naked assertion of power. It is used to liberate the creative capacities of the social order. It derives its ethical sanction from the positive social function. The anarchical system which prevails where power rules, and where nations go about heavily armed, must be changed. International anarchy produces slave empires and Hitlers. The alternative is a system of international relations based on law, co-operation and peace. We must arm the judge and not the litigant. If we work for an international system of peaceful co-operation, imperialist powers must divest themselves of the economic advantages and privileges which they acquired in a system of power politics.

It is sometimes said that we might have limited federations which will reduce the risk of war in certain geographical areas. But this would not solve the problem, since the relations of states are not limited geographically. Inter-state relations are world relations, and cannot be carried on without a world organisation or government. The League of Nations is a part of the movement away from power and force to law based on consent and co-operation. It is an attempt to determine international relationships by non-violent methods of discussion, compromise and law. The League Covenant broke down in Manchuria, in Ethiopia, in Spain, in Albania, in Austria, to say nothing of what happened at Munich. The Council and the Assembly were shy from the start to take any action that might suggest disrespect to the doctrine of state sovereignty. The cynical view taken by the "Senior Judge of the Court of International Justice at the Hague," in Bernard Shaw's play

[1] Cp. "Justice without force is powerless. Force without justice is tyranny. Justice without force is unavailing, for there will always be malefactors. Force without justice is justly condemned. Justice and force must march hand in hand so that that which is just may be strong and that which is strong may be just."—*Pensées*.

Geneva, is not altogether pointless.[1] Mr. Neville Chamberlain in his broadcast speech said: "However much we may sympathise with a small nation confronted by a big, powerful neighbour, we cannot in all circumstances undertake to involve the whole British Empire in war simply on her account. If we have to fight it must be on larger issues than that." "If I were convinced that any nation had made up its mind to dominate the world by fear of its force, I should feel that it must be resisted."[2] This is not the teaching of the Covenant. It is the old policy of balance of power. Britain will not go to war to save Belgium or Czecho-Slovakia; only the curbing of a powerful neighbour, whether it be Hitler, or the Kaiser, or Napoleon, is a sufficient justification for war. National self-regarding aims are more important than international justice. Harold Nicolson points out that Britain is at war owing to a "sound biological instinct, the instinct of self-preservation," to which various names are given: "The Balance of power," "The Protection of Smaller Nations," etc. The League failed, because those who joined it did not wish to give up the rights acquired by the use of violence. It was used to stabilise an unjust order, and thus gave respectability to the old game of power politics. Disinterestedness of nations was more difficult to attain than even the unselfishness of individuals. Besides, it had no effective sanction behind it. It was like a gun that fired blank cartridges. If the League is to function properly, it must have permanent authorities, one which shall make the law and rules which are to regulate the relations between states, and the other which shall decide disputes in accordance with these laws and rules. The latter may be empowered to make radical changes in the relations of states. Any League should possess a Legislature (federal parliament), a Court of Justice and an Executive authority; for no nation can be a judge of its own cause, or punisher of its own wrongs. Just as we have an established system of law backed by force which is disinterested and public, for restraining the aggression of individuals, we require also an

[1] "*Sir Orpheus Midlander:* But surely such a procedure was never contemplated when the Powers joined the League?

The Senior Judge: I do not think anything was contemplated when the Powers joined the League. They signed the Covenant without reading it, to oblige President Wilson. The United States then refused to sign it to disoblige President Wilson, also without reading it. Since then the Powers have behaved in every respect as if the League did not exist, except when they could use it for their own purposes.

Sir Orpheus Midlander: But how else could they use it?

The Senior Judge: They could use it to maintain justice and order between the nations."—P. 40.

[2] 27th September 1939.

international police force. If a state breaks the law of nations and resorts to force, the law must be backed by the force of the community of states, and the aggressor state should be brought to account. It is not right, in the present conditions, to object that the League attempts to prevent war by war. While this is certainly so, there cannot be a complete abdication of force in the present conditions. In human relations the choice is not between good and bad, but between what is bad and what is worse. The unregulated use of force by the states is infinitely worse than the use of force by the world commonwealth as the sanction of law. We cannot further the rule of law and the method of co-operation unless the power of the community of states is used, in the last resort, to maintain the law against those who resort to violence. The Hindu treatises on inter-state relations suggest the four methods of sāma (friendship), dāna (appeasement), bheda (mutual dissensions), and daṇḍa (armed resistance). Non-violence may be unattainable if we wish to obtain it at one rush; but we may reach it if we are prepared to work towards it by stages.

The other objection is that the nation states today are not in a mood to treat an act of war against one as an act of war against all. There is not that community of interests among sovereign states which will back the authority of the League. The Allied nations, which have the common bond of ideals, may form themselves during the period of the war into a Federation, with a Parliament or Congress directly elected by the peoples, and after the war other countries might be admitted. A new society is struggling to be born, and the old order seeks to prevent it. Those who fight against the Axis powers are on the side of Revolution. If we will the end of freedom and democracy, we must will the means to it. There is no other way to a peace that is enduring.

Education in Values

If our civilisation perishes it will not be due to ignorance of what is needed to save it. It will be due to resistance to adopting the remedy, even when the patient appears to be dying. We are lacking in moral energy and social imagination to understand the principles of the new society of peace and ordered liberty. The purpose of education is not to fit us to the social environment, but to help us to fight against evil things, to create a more perfect society.

This world does not evolve through savagery and bloodshed. This war is not an inevitable stage in the evolutionary struggle to a happy future. We are not so completely at the mercy of the social environment as the evolutionary view suggests. It is the failure of man that is reflected in the social failure. If the League failed, it is because the will to work the League was not there. Political institutions cannot outrun the sentiments and habits of thought of the individual citizens. Political wisdom cannot be in advance of social maturity. Social progress cannot be achieved by external means. It is determined by man's intimate transcendent experiences. We must work for the renewal of the heart, the transformation of values, the surrender of the spirit to the claims of the eternal. We all look up at the same stars, we dream beneath the same sky, we are fellow-passengers on the same planet; and it does not matter if we endeavour to find the ultimate truth along different roads. The riddle of existence is so great that there cannot be only one road leading to an answer.

Devices from the spinning-wheel to the internal combustion engine are devices of purely social utility. They have no intrinsic moral value. They are valuable only if they are subordinated to higher moral ends. The means of progress are not ends in themselves. The habit of perverting values by subordinating the eternal to the temporal, the essential to the accidental, the lasting to the transient, can be checked only by a powerful education. Education is man's perennial birth in the spirit; it is the road to the inward kingdom. For all outward glory is but a reflection of the inward light. Education presupposes the selection of, and adherence to, supreme values. We must work for a community which is wider and deeper than the state. The nature of that community depends on our ideals. If we are liberals, it is humanity; if we are conservatives, it is the nation; if we are communists, it is the world proletariat; if we are Nazis, it is the Race. The state itself is not the final end. There is a wider community to which our deepest loyalty is due.

The final ends of political action are to be considered by the thinker and the writer. In them society becomes conscious and critical of itself. They are the guardians of the values of a society, the values which are the real life and character of a society. Their business is to educate us to a consciousness of the real self of society, to save us from spiritual callousness and mental vulgarity. They

must help us to develop friendship and fellow-feeling among the peoples of the world. Without friendship, says Aristotle, there is no justice. The great thinkers refuse to look upon anything smaller than humanity as the object of their love. The world is for them one family. Goethe felt it impossible to hate the French. He wrote to Eckermann: "For me who am not war-like, and have no feeling for war, such songs would have been a mask which would have fitted me very ill. I have never shammed in my poetry. How could I have written songs of hate without hatred? And, between ourselves, I did not hate the French, though I thanked God when we got rid of them. How could I, to whom civilisation and barbarism are the only two differences of importance, hate a nation which is one of the most civilised on earth, and to which I owe so great a part of my own education? In general, national animosity is a peculiar thing. In the lowest degrees of civilisation it is always strongest and most violent. But there is a point where it vanishes —where we stand, as it were, above the nations and we feel the happiness or misery of a neighbouring people as though it were our own." Patriotism is ordinarily only hatred disguised in acceptable terms, and commended to the common people with striped cloth, silver medals and sweet hymns. Love of the world is the ideal end to which the love of country is the means. Even our enemies are human beings. They react in the same way to pleasure and pain. We are brothers and sisters under our skin. We must recover our sanity and calm, and feel restless in the madhouse of the world which is becoming unbearably noisy and cruel. This world must be governed with wisdom.

The intellectuals need not take an active part in politics or in the actual affairs of administration. It is their primary function to serve society with intellectual integrity. They must create the social consciousness and sense of responsibility which transcend the limits of the political community. Those who can serve society in this way have a duty not to engage in politics. For every society there will be a few for whom participation in political activity would be a perversion of genius, a disloyalty to themselves. By staying where they are, they remain true to their genius, they help to remove a little society's ignorance of itself. To be free from the world is the condition of their contribution. They must serve the social and spiritual values, but unfortunately totalitarian regimes subordinate social and intellectual activities to their own ends.

The new politics are political religion, based on messianic hopes of social salvation. The spiritual fathers of totalitarianisms are the intelligentsia. If the intellectuals abandon the interests of culture, and repudiate the primacy of spiritual values, we cannot blame the politicians who are responsible for the safety of the State. If the ship's captain puts the safety of the vessel before the interests of the passengers, we cannot blame him. The State is a means, not an end. There will be a few people who live in and for a world of absolute values, of which neither life nor comfort is one. Political and economic values are relative and subsidiary. They are means to ends. The prophets help us to see the invisible, and reveal to us the eternal under the conditions of present life. They are careless of the values of this world, and devoted to the realisation of goodness. They see unity, and make others see it. They appeal to our sense of fellow-feeling. They have the courage of the heart, the courtesy of the spirit and the laughter of the unafraid. Thomas Naylor, of the Society of Friends, in "his last testimony, said to be delivered by him about two hours before his Departure," said:

"There is a spirit, which I feel, that delights to do no evil, nor to revenge any wrong, but delights to endure all things in hope to enjoy its own in the end. Its hope is to outlive all wrath and contention, and to weary out all exaltation and cruelty, or whatever is of a nature contrary to itself. It sees to the end of all temptations. As it bears no evil in itself, so it conceives none in thoughts to any other. If it is betrayed, it bears it. . . . It is conceived in sorrow, and brought forth without any to pity it; nor doth it murmur at grief and oppression. It never rejoiceth but through sufferings; for with the world's joy it is murdered. I found it alone, being forsaken. I have fellowship therein with them who lived in dens and desolate places."

Gāndhi

Only now and again does there arise above the common level some rare spirit, who, having looked upon God face to face, reflects more clearly the divine purpose, and puts into practice more courageously the divine guidance. The light of such a man shines like a strong beacon on a dark and disordered world. India is better today, because there has come into its life a personality that is a flame from God. His suffering embodies the wounded pride

of India, and in his satyāgraha is reflected the eternal patience of her wisdom. An intrepid spirit, an almost impregnable will-power, and a superhuman passion for truth and justice are his main characteristics. Gāndhi presents to us the purest, the most elevating and the most inspiring ideal known to man. His is a spiritual influence, a cleansing, purifying flame, which has burned up much dross and revealed much pure gold. All his life has been one continuous fight against the unspiritual. There are many who dismiss him as a professional politician who bungles at critical moments. In one sense politics are a profession and the politician, like a lawyer, or an engineer, is one who is trained to transact public business in an efficient manner. There is another sense in which politics are a vocation, and the politician is one who is conscious of a mission to save his people, and inspire them with a love of the common ideal. Such a one may fail in the practical business of government, and yet succeed in filling his fellows with an invincible faith in their common cause. Leaders like Cromwell and Lincoln may combine both. They may be at once the personal embodiment of social ideals, and practical organisers of public affairs. Gāndhi, while he may not be well equipped in the art of government, is really a politician in the second sense. More than all, he is the voice of the new world, the voice of a fuller life, of a wider, more comprehensive consciousness. He has firm faith that we can build a world without poverty and unemployment, without wars and bloodshed, on the basis of religion. "In that world there will be a faith in God greater and deeper than ever in the past. The very existence of the world in a broad sense depends on religion." He says: "The world of tomorrow will be, must be, a society based on non-violence. It may seem a distant goal, an impractical Utopia. But it is not in the least unobtainable, since it can be worked from here and now. An individual can adopt the way of life of the future —the non-violent way—without having to wait for others to do so. And if an individual can do it, cannot whole groups of individuals? Whole nations? Men often hesitate to make a beginning because they feel that the objective cannot be achieved in its entirety. This attitude of mind is precisely our greatest obstacle to progress—an obstacle that each man, if he only wills it, can clear away."[1] We must put aside the view that environment is overpowering, and that we are helpless.

[1] *Liberty* (London).

If the eternal good is to be realised in time, we must use only such means as are intrinsically good. All short-cuts to achieve it quickly, or by force through actions intrinsically evil, are doomed to frustration. Between violent restraint and moral appeal to the criminal, the latter is preferable. It is argued that if physical coercion is bad, moral coercion is no better. It is coercive, not persuasive, violent rather than loving. Without firing a shot or using a lathi, masses of people may be coerced, against their will or their better judgment, to take a certain course of action. Yet moral suasion is the better course, for it implies freedom to accept or reject.

Non-violence is not an excuse for cowardice or weakness. It is the expression of strength. Only those who have the qualities of valour, suffering, and the spirit of sacrifice, can restrain themselves, and not resort to the use of arms. It is dangerous to be non-violent out of fear for the consequence of violence. It is wrong to think that Gāndhi's view puts life above liberty. Gāndhi knows that to suffer in one's body, and to die, are physical evils which can be borne and justified, if thereby we create a good that compensates for them. It is no use destroying men; we must destroy their manners. If the present rulers are overthrown, but the system remains unaltered, nothing is gained. Fighting on the fronts is not the worst evil. What is worse than that is the condition of society, which makes possible the manifestation of violence by the strong on the weak. Hitlers are only outward symptoms of a septic condition of society, which cannot be cured merely by dressing the sores or cutting them out. If society is to be saved, resistance to the present order is necessary; but it should be resistance which will put down lies and insincerity. Death is not worse than a dishonourable life.

Non-violent resistance requires fortitude and discipline; but these qualities are needed in wars also. If men are willing to die on the battlefield, they must show the same courage and idealism in non-violent resistance. We may lose more in war than in this kind of resistance.

It is argued that non-resisters may have to face the prospect of their country being annihilated. But even resisters may have to face that result. Tribunals ask conscientious objectors as to what they would do if the Germans come to rape their wives, sisters or mothers. They will, of course, prevent them from doing so, but

not murder the wives, sisters and daughters of Germans. The analogy is not legitimate, because the use of force in self-defence by the individual victim of an aggression is quite different from wars where force is used against innocent persons. Gāndhi's non-violence is an active force, the weapon not of the weak but of the brave. "If blood be shed, let it be our blood. Cultivate the quiet courage of dying without killing. For man lives freely only by his readiness to die, if need be, at the hands of his brother, never by killing him. . . . Love does not burn others, it burns itself, suffering joyfully even unto death."

Non-violence is not acquiescence in evil. Gāndhi knows that the greatest misfortune is submission to injustice, not the suffering of it. He does not ask us to follow the example of Plato's philosopher who, seeing the madness of the multitude and like a man sheltering behind a wall in a storm of dust and hail, felt almost inclined to abandon the world to the evil which had overshadowed it. Non-violence is not doing nothing. We can resist evil by refusing to co-operate with it. Indian history is full of examples of non-violent non-co-operation: the Mahājans who closed their shops as a protest against the unrestricted power of the king; the Brāhmins of Benares who fasted as a protest against the imposition of taxes by the East India Company; the Rājput ladies who immolated themselves to save their honour from the lust of the invaders. These examples illustrate the might of the human spirit to overcome evil. Non-violent resistance relies not on strong muscles, devastating armaments and fiendish poison gases, but on moral courage, self-control, on the gripping awareness that there is in every human being, however brutal, however personally hostile: a burning light of kindness, a love of justice, a respect for goodness and truth, which can be roused by anyone who uses the right means. The sacrifice of Telemachus was needed to ensure that gladiators should no longer be butchered to make a Roman holiday.

Gāndhi applies his methods to the question of India's freedom. We must be content to die if we cannot live as free men and women. British rule in India is based on co-operation, on the willing and genuine consent of the vast majority of the Indian people. If this co-operation is withheld, the rule collapses. There are different steps we might take in this method of non-violent non-co-operation. What applies to India's fight for freedom applies also in cases of external aggression. It is said that in a world where war is totali-

tarian, where combatants are no longer in contact with one another but organise massacres from afar, non-violent non-co-operation may appear to be ineffective, though heroic. If India refrains from resisting the Japanese invasion by violence, but to the last man, woman and child refuses to do any work, or sell any food, or render any service, but endures stripes, jail, gunshot and other forms of violence, she will succeed in overcoming the enemy. The adoption of this policy requires a bravery, a courage, an endurance which is unequalled even in war. The alien invaders will not get men to occupy posts of policemen, postmen, etc. The whole population cannot be imprisoned. They cannot all be shot. After shooting a few, the attempt will have to be given up in despair. Revenue cannot be raised, and there will be strikes among dock labourers, etc.[1] No government can function unless the population is reconciled.[2] India's resistance would be effective. All this is to be done

[1] Even in the present conditions, the policy of non-co-operation with the enemy will have to be adopted. General Molesworth, Deputy Chief of General Staff, in an address to the Rotary Club at Delhi in March 1942, said: "Everybody in India is asking how we are going to keep the Japanese out. From the point of view of the army in this enormous battlefront, we shall hold vital places which it is necessary to hold in order to make India safe, but we cannot hold every one. Therefore what is to be done for the rest of India where we are unable to put troops, air or naval forces? We cannot arm all. On the other hand, we can do a great deal to educate the masses to give the Japanese a great deal of trouble and delay and destroy invasion. It may be there is no proper lead and no proper leadership down below. Still, I feel that the Japanese invasion can be beaten if we educate the people on the lines of 'They shall not pass.' Psychologically it can only be done by the intelligentsia working definitely shoulder to shoulder with worker and peasant."

[2] Cp. Gāndhi's message to the Czechs when they surrendered in October 1938: "I want to speak to the Czechs because their plight moved me to the point of physical and mental distress, and I felt that it would be cowardice on my part not to share with them the thoughts that were welling up within me. It is clear that the small nations must come or be ready to come under the protection of the dictators or be a constant menace to the peace of Europe. In spite of all the goodwill in the world, England and France cannot save them. Their intervention can only mean bloodshed and destruction such as has never been seen before. If I were a Czech, therefore, I would free these two nations from the obligation to defend my country. And yet I must live. I would not be a vassal to any nation or body. I must have absolute independence or perish. To seek to win in a clash of arms would be pure bravado. Not so if in defying the might of one who would deprive me of my independence I refused to obey his will and perished unarmed in the attempt. In so doing, though I lose the body, I save my soul, i.e. my honour. This inglorious peace should be my opportunity. I must live down the humiliation and gain real independence. But, says a comforter, 'Hitler knows no pity. Your spiritual effort will avail nothing before him.' My answer is, 'You may be right. History has no record of a nation having adopted non-violent resistance. If Hitler is unaffected by suffering it does not matter. For I shall have lost nothing worthy. My honour is the only thing worth preserving. That is independent of Hitler's pity. But as a believer in non-violence, I may not limit its possibilities. Hitherto he and his likes have built upon their invariable experience that men yield to force. Unarmed men, women and children offering non-violent resistance without any bitterness in them will be a novel experience for them. Who can dare say that it is not in their nature to respond to the higher and finer forces? They have the same soul that I have.' But, says another comforter, 'What

with love and no hatred for the oppressors, and in the process the country becomes purified, ennobled and free.[1]

you say is all right for you. But how do you expect your people to respond to the novel call? They are trained to fight. In personal bravery they are second to none in the world. For you, now, to ask them to throw away their arms and be trained for non-violent resistance seems to me to be a vain attempt.' You may be right. But I have a call I must answer. I must deliver my message to my people. This humiliation has sunk too deep in me to remain without an outlet. I, at least, must act up to the light that has dawned on me. This is how I should, I believe, act if I were Czech. When I first launched out on satyāgraha, I had no companion. We were thirteen thousand men, women and children against a whole nation capable of crushing the existence out of us. I did not know who would listen to me. It all came as in a flash. All the 13,000 did not fight. Many fell back. But the honour of the nation was saved. New history was written by the South African satyāgraha. I present Dr. Benes with a weapon not of the weak but of the brave. There is no bravery greater than a resolute refusal to bend the knee to an earthly power, no matter how great, and that without bitterness of spirit and in the fullness of faith that the spirit alone lives, nothing else does."

[1] Here is what Bertrand Russell says on *War and Non-resistance*:

"We will suppose the invading army arrived in London, where they would evict the King from Buckingham Palace and the Members from the House of Commons. A few able bureaucrats would be brought over from Berlin to consult with the Civil Servants in Whitehall as to the new laws by which the reign of Kultur was to be inaugurated. No difficulty would be expected in managing so tame a nation, and at first almost all the existing officials would be confirmed in their offices. For the government of a large modern state is a complicated matter, and it would be thought well to facilitate the transition by the help of men familiar with the existing machinery.

"But at this point, if the nation showed as much courage as it has always shown in fighting, difficulties would begin. All the existing officials would refuse to co-operate with the Germans. Some of the more prominent would be imprisoned, perhaps even shot, in order to encourage the others. But if the others held firm, if they refused to recognise or transmit any order given by the Germans, if they continued to carry out the decrees previously made by the English Parliament and the English Government, the Germans would have to dismiss them all, even to the humblest postman, and call in German talent to fill the breach.

"The dismissed officials could not all be imprisoned or shot. Since no fighting would have occurred, such wholesale brutality would be out of the question. And it would be very difficult for the Germans suddenly, out of nothing, to create an administrative machine. Whatever edicts they might issue would be quietly ignored by the population. If they ordered that German should be the language taught in schools, the schoolmasters would go on as if no such order had been issued; if the schoolmasters were dismissed the parents would no longer send the children to school. If they ordered that English young men should undergo military service, the young men would simply refuse; after shooting a few, the Germans would have to give up the attempt in despair. If they tried to raise revenue by customs duties at the ports, they would have to have German customs officers; this would lead to a strike of all the dock labourers, so that this way of raising revenue would become impossible. If they tried to take over the railways, there would be a strike of railway servants. Whatever they touched would instantly become paralysed, and it would soon be evident, even to them, that nothing was to be made out of England unless the population could be conciliated.

"Such a method of dealing with invasion would, of course, require fortitude and discipline. But fortitude and discipline are required in war. For ages past education has been largely directed to producing these qualities for the sake of war. They now exist so widely that in every civilised country almost every man is willing to die on the battlefield whenever his Government thinks the moment suitable. The same courage and idealism which are now put into war could quite easily be directed by education into the channel of passive resistance. I do not know what losses England may suffer before the present war is ended, but if they amount to a million no one will be surprised. An immensely smaller number of losses, incurred in passive resistance, would prove to

Non-violent resistance is also a form of resistance, and therefore coercion. How is it superior to armed resistance? We have to judge it by results. Application of force tends to demoralise those who use it. The temper of mind which enjoys working itself up to a fury against our enemies is not to be encouraged. There is the spiritual pride that we are lovable, while our enemies are to be detested. We are incapable of progress until we break out of the bondage of hatred. Non-violent resistance does not create new evils which might tend to hinder any good that might be intended. We meet the challenge without suffering moral degradation ourselves.

When the spirit of savagery seems to brood over the whole world, Gāndhi appeals to the best in us, and proclaims that endurance will have a purpose and effort a goal. Gāndhi knows that, unless we are renewed in our whole relationship to life and truth, we are not capable of non-violent resistance to evil. We must develop the inner sense of right, and not do violence to our individual integrity, whatever happens. We cannot lift the whole world with undue haste to the highest level. The Hindu śāstras teach that we should not abandon the attempt to incarnate the ideal in society as a whole. The order of saññyāsins is the embodied conscience of mankind, reminding us of the world of higher values to which even common men respond. With them the renunciation of armed force is a matter of absolute principle. They have cast off all fear and anger, and have no need for the material things for which men fight. These 'elect' souls go beyond the give-and-take of law. They witness to the evil of war by going beyond the protection of the state; but they cannot enforce it as a command on other people and deprive men of the protection of law. While they may give up their claims against those who oppress, they cannot force their views on those of a different opinion. As a policy for a nation, non-violent non-co-operation is justifiable only if we are fairly certain that the nation is really prepared to act on such a policy. But the few who not only talk of peace and think of it, but will it with all their souls, when faced by a crisis, would prefer the four walls of a cell to a tent on the battlefield, would be prepared to stand against a wall, to be spat upon, to be stoned, to be shot.

any invading army that the task of subjecting England to alien domination was an impossible one. And this proof would be made once and for all, without dependence upon the doubtful accidents of war."

If we are not ready for non-violent resistance, it is better to resist wrongs by violence than not to resist at all. "Where the only choice is between cowardice and violence I advise violence. I cultivate the quiet courage of dying without killing. But to him who has not this courage, I advise killing and being killed rather than the emasculation of the race. I would rather have India resort to arms to defend her honour, than that she should in a cowardly manner become, or remain, a helpless victim of her own dishonour."

Gāndhi is not a doctrinaire. "I do not say: 'eschew violence in your dealing with robbers or thieves, or with nations that may invade India.' But in order to be better able to do so, we must learn to restrain ourselves. It is a sign not of strength but of weakness, to take up the pistol on the slightest pretext. Mutual fisticuffs are a training not in violence but in emasculation. My method of non-violence can never lead to loss of strength, but it alone will make it possible, if the nation wills it, to offer disciplined and concerted violence in time of danger."[1] "My non-violence does not admit of running away from danger, and leaving dear ones unprotected. Between violence and cowardly flight, I can only prefer violence to cowardice. I can no more preach non-violence to a coward than I can tempt a blind man to enjoy healthy scenes. Non-violence is the summit of bravery. And in my own experience I have had no difficulty in demonstrating to men, trained in the school of violence, the superiority of non-violence. As a coward, which I was for years, I harboured violence. I began to prize non-violence only when I began to shed cowardice."[2]

"Non-violence cannot be taught to a person who fears to die and has no power of resistance. A helpless mouse is not non-violent because he is always eaten by pussy. He would gladly eat the murderess if he could, but he ever tries to flee from her. We do not call him a coward, because he is made by nature to behave no better than he does. But a man who, when faced by danger,

[1] *Young India*, 29th May 1924.

[2] *Ibid.*, 29th May 1924. "My creed of non-violence is an extremely active force. It has no room for cowardice or even weakness. There is hope for a violent man to be some day non-violent, but there is none for a coward. I have, therefore, said more than once in these pages that if we do not know how to defend ourselves, our women and our places of worship, by the force of suffering, i.e. non-violence, we must, if we are men, be at least able to defend all these by fighting" (*Ibid.*, 16th September 1927). "The world is not entirely governed by logic. Life itself involves some kind of violence, and we have to choose the path of least violence" (28th September 1934).

behaves like a mouse, is rightly called a coward. He harbours violence and hatred in his heart, and would kill his enemy if he could without hurting himself. He is a stranger to non-violence. All sermonizing on it will be lost on him. Bravery is foreign to his nature. Before he can understand non-violence, he has to be taught to stand his ground and even suffer death, in the attempt to defend himself against the aggressor who bids fair to overwhelm him. To do otherwise would be to confirm his cowardice, and take him further away from non-violence. Whilst I may not actually help anyone to retaliate, I must not let a coward seek shelter behind non-violence so-called. Not knowing the stuff of which non-violence is made, many have honestly believed that running away from danger every time was a virtue compared to offering resistance, especially when it was fraught with danger to one's life. As a teacher of non-violence I must, so far as it is possible for me, guard against such an unmanly belief. Non-violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of man. Destruction is not the law of the humans. Man lives freely by his readiness to die, if need be, at the hands of his brother, never by killing him. Every murder or other injury, no matter for what cause, committed or inflicted on another is a crime against humanity."[1] "No matter how weak a person is in body, if it is a shame to flee, he will stand his ground and die at his post. This would be non-violent bravery. No matter how weak he is, he will use what strength he has in inflicting injury on his opponent and die in the attempt. This is bravery, but not non-violence. If, when his duty is to face danger, he flees, it is cowardice. In the first case the man will have love or charity in him. In the second and third cases, there would be a dislike or distrust and fear."[2]

"The doctrine of non-violence is not for the weak and the cowardly; it is meant for the brave and the strong. The bravest man allows himself to be killed without killing. And he desists from killing or injuring, because he knows that it is wrong to injure."[3]

"If one has not the courage, I want him to cultivate the art of killing and being killed, rather than in a cowardly manner flee from danger. . . . For the latter in spite of his flight does commit

[1] *Harijan*, 30th July 1935.
[2] *Ibid.*, 17th August 1935.
[3] *Ibid.*, 20th July 1937.

mental *hiṁsā*. He flees because he has not the courage to be killed in the act of killing."[1] All this is an echo of the Hindu view.

Life at best is a long second best, the perpetual compromise between the ideal and the possible. The Kingdom of God knows no compromise, no practical limitations. But here on earth there are the pitiless laws of Nature. There are the human passions, and we have to build an ordered cosmos on their basis. The world is not the natural home of perfection. It seems to be the kingdom of chance and error. Caprice apparently rules without mercy in great things and small. What is noble and good seldom attains to expression; the absurd and the perverse assert their supremacy. Above this darkness, the firmament of spirit arches in shining radiance. Through effort and difficulty ideals struggle to realisation. When we are faced with things as they are, the problem is not how much evil to cast out but, as Burke so acutely put it, how much evil to tolerate.

In the progress of societies three stages are marked: the first, where the law of the jungle prevails, where we have violence and selfishness; the second, where there are rule of law and impartial justice with courts, police and prisons; and the third, where we have non-violence and unselfishness, where love and law are one. The last is the goal of civilised humanity; and it can be brought nearer by the increase in the numbers of men and women who have renounced reliance, not only on force, but on other benefits the state can confer or withdraw from them, who have literally left home and sacrificed personal ambition, who die daily that the world may live in peace. Such a one is Gāndhi. He will be remembered when the names of the realists, who advise the world to ignore him, are utterly forgotten. Though his ideal may now seem impossible of attainment, it will be realised. Of such was it written:

> Thou hast great allies,
> Thy friends are exultations, agonies
> And love, and Man's unconquerable mind.

He is not today a free man; you may crucify the body of such a one, but the light in him, which is from the divine flame of truth and love, cannot be put out. One of these days he will throw away his life to give his people life. The world will look back to him some day, and salute him as one born out of his time, one who had seen the light in a dark and savage world.

[1] *Harijan*, 15th January 1938.

Postscript

SINCE the book was written, events have moved rapidly in India. Gāndhi's non-co-operation movement, which used ordinary men and women who were an incredible mixture of heroism and conceit, magnificence and meanness, for an unarmed revolt against British rule, came to a partly successful termination on August 15th 1947. The present position in India was indicated by me in a statement broadcast through the All India Radio Delhi on the Independence day.

Indian Independence

History and legend will grow round the 15th of August 1947, as that date marks a milestone in the world's march towards democracy. In the drama of a people rebuilding and transforming themselves, it is a significant date. The night of India's subjection has been long, full of fateful portents and silent prayers of men for the dawn of freedom. For this day sacrifices have been made and there have been weepings and sorrows, haunting spectres of hunger and death. Steadily through the night the sentinels have kept watch; the lights have been burning bright and now the dawn which breaks the night of ages has come.

That this transition from subjection to freedom should have been effected by democratic procedure is an occasion as happy as it is unique. The rule of the British is ending in an orderly way.

It is not necessary to trace the course of events that led to the establishment of British supremacy in India. This supremacy was never fully accepted by the people. The great Indian Mutiny was the first organised attempt to overthrow British rule. After the mutiny was put down, an Act for the better government of India in 1858 transferred the entire administration from the East India Company to the Crown. The Indian National Congress under Viceregal encouragement started its work in 1885 for organising public opinion for self-government. Britain's difficulties in the Boer War, Russia's defeat in the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, led to the revival of the nationalist spirit and the adoption of revolutionary methods. To allay the 'unrest' the Morley-Minto Reforms were introduced, though these sowed the seeds of dissension by conceding the principle

of separate communal representation. The successive reforms of 1919 and 1935 were an answer to the increasing resistance of the people. In 1942 the non-violent resistance of the Congress caused a good deal of headache to the British, so much so that even Churchill was obliged to send the Cripps Mission, which, he admitted, was sent "when the Japanese held full naval command of the Bay of Bengal and it seemed that India might be invaded and ravaged by a large Japanese army". After the war the British found that the political organisations of the country would not support the continuation of the British rule. The attempt to capture the machinery of government resulted in large-scale communal 'killings' which the British could neither prevent nor control. The civil administration practically broke down, and to maintain law and order the British had to employ armed forces, which was perhaps beyond their power and certainly beyond the willingness of the British public to undertake. So on the 20th February 1947 Mr. Attlee said that 'they now desire to carry the previous Indian policy to its complete fulfilment' and quit India.

In the House of Commons Mr. Attlee spoke with obvious pride of this courageous act of abnegation. It is the first instance, he said, when an Imperial power voluntarily transferred its authority to a subject people whom it had ruled with force and firmness for nearly two centuries. In the past, empires were liquidated either by pressure near the centre as in Rome, or by exhaustion as in Spain, or by military defeat as in the case of the Axis powers. For deliberate surrender of authority there is no parallel except in the American withdrawal from the Philippines or perhaps the British withdrawal from South Africa, though all these are very different in scale and circumstances. To a strong people nothing can ever be harder than to do something which is likely to be attributed to motives of weakness or cowardice. If the British decided to quit India we may agree that it is due not so much to a sense of weakness as to an unwillingness to use the methods of blood and steel. They listened to the demand of the Indian people and by an act of courageous statesmanship blotted out the memory of past ill-will and friction. When we look at the way in which the Dutch are behaving in Indonesia or the French are clinging to their possessions, we must admire the political sagacity and courage of the British. We on our side have added a glorious chapter to the history of the world by furnishing an instance where a subject race has won its freedom

by opposing patience to fury, quietness of spirit to bureaucratic tyranny. Gāndhi and those who followed him participated in the long battle of India's freedom with clean weapons and civilised dignity. They have won the struggle without leaving behind any hatred or bitterness of spirit. The appointment of Lord Mountbatten as the Governor General of India illustrates the spirit of friendliness and understanding that prevails between erstwhile enemies. A new era in British Indian history is thus opened as the fruit of a century of effort and struggle, and it will go down as the most outstanding event in living memory.

There is, however, a shadow over our rejoicings, a sadness in our hearts, for the independence we dreamed of and fought for has not come to us. Such is the perversity of things that the Swaraj of our dreams at the moment of its attainment has slipped through our fingers. A divided India will continue to be dependent unless the two Dominions establish friendly relations and work for common interests. The extent of our disappointment is reflected in the satisfaction of the Tories in England. While Churchill characterised the Cabinet Mission Report as a 'melancholy document' and the declaration to quit as a 'scuttle' from India, he gave enthusiastic support to the present plan, thus indicating that it implements the Conservative policy for India.

At a time when the States of the world are moving towards large groups, we are throwing away the one advantage of political and economic unity which British rule brought to this country. When the new conditions demand economic planning on a Continental scale, we are reverting to a divided India. Whether India will be safer with two armies than with one remains to be seen.

If our leaders graciously took up the responsibility for the decision to divide the country, it is because they found no other alternative acceptable to the different parties. By a succession of acts of surrender we found ourselves in a position from which division was the only way out.

India has had Englishmen of different varieties, Englishmen who came here for a hundred different reasons, priests and nuns, merchants and adventurers, soldiers and diplomats, statesmen and idealists. They marched and fought in it, bought and sold in it, plotted and profited in it. But the greatest of them wished to raise India's social and economic standards and political status. They worked for the welfare of the people and the modernisation of the

country. But the small-minded amongst them worked with sinister objectives. When separate communal electorates were conceded, Lady Minto refers to a letter received from an important official: "I must send your Excellency a line to say that a very very big thing has happened today. A work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian history for many a long year. It is nothing less than the pulling back of 62 millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition." Separate electorates intensified communal consciousness and created such an atmosphere of mistrust and hostility as to arouse the demand for Pakistan. Cripps' proposals made Pakistan possible and the Muslims naturally inferred that the British would support their proposal. While the Cabinet Mission rejected the demand for Pakistan it made extensive concessions to it by limiting the powers of the centre and proposing sections and groups. The Congress declaration that they will not force a constitution on any unwilling part of the country encouraged the League in its determination to demand a division of the country into Muslim and non-Muslim zones. There has never been a government known to history which did not at times use compulsion to ensure the co-operation of the recalcitrant. When the southern American States demanded independence, the right to govern themselves, Abraham Lincoln at the cost of one of the bloodiest wars known to history denied that right on the ground that, if it were granted, democracy in the new world would be too divided to defend itself. But the Congress pledged to the principle of non-violence cannot use force in evolving national solidarity. The statement of 20th February 1947 suggested that the British Government would transfer power to some form of Central Government or in certain areas to the existing provincial governments, or in such other way as may seem most reasonable and in the best interests of an independent people. The present plan is the natural outcome of these developments. Past encouragement by the British and present temper of our leaders proved too strong for friendly agreements.

We cannot attribute all our troubles to the British. We have lent ourselves to the policy of separatism. We have been ready victims of it. Unless we cure ourselves of our national faults of character we cannot rebuild a united India. What faces us is not so much a political division as a psychological split. India today is not in a normal condition. The accumulated mistrusts and tensions will take time to subside. If freedom is to be a positive, dynamic,

liberating force it must manifest itself in tolerance for each other's views, truths and beliefs. Because the country is divided we should not delude ourselves that the crisis is past. Immediate relaxation of tension is not enough.

Though our hearts be laden with sorrow, we must put our country on its way to progress. The Indian body politic is no more. But the Indian body historic lives on, no matter how absent-minded and divided against itself and unaware of its own existence. Political divisions are not permanent. Cultural and spiritual ties are more enduring. We must foster them with care and reverence. Islam spread in India by conversion—not immigration. Ninety per cent. of the Muslims belong to the same social and ethnic stock, inherit the same culture, inhabit the same territory and possess the same habits and modes of belief. We must develop unity by a slow process of education, patient consideration and eventual realisation that the issues which led to the partition are in fact already obsolete. The cure for communalism lies in first curing the evils of poverty, ill health, illiteracy, agricultural and industrial backwardness. If these are controlled, communal differences are not likely to remain seriously provocative. Between the two parts of Pakistan the Dominion of India lies and Pakistan must enter into some relationship with this Dominion in the matter of communications. On the question of Indonesia the two Dominions have a common policy. On many other matters the geographical situation will demand a common foreign policy. The development of water power and transport will require joint action. Thus we can promote the real unity of the country by the co-operation of the two dominions for mutual welfare, by the free intercourse among their inhabitants and by the defence of common ideals. Fervid speeches and resolutions will not do. The language of anger never helps. Patience and understanding are the need of the hour.

There must be a sense of exhilaration when we feel that we are our own masters, that we can decide our own future. We may make mistakes—grave, perhaps avoidable—but all these are nothing in comparison with the stimulus that comes from freedom. The existing conditions are a challenge to our competence and wisdom. The greatest calamity will be when power outstrips ability. Let it not be said that when the test came we were found unequal. We have not gained the promised land. We have to work to clear the way for it. The path is long and arduous. It may be through blood

and tears, toil and suffering. The people will conquer in the end. Some of us may not live to see it but we can foresee it.

A civilisation is not something solid and external. It is the people's dream, their imaginative interpretation of human existence, their perception of the mystery of human life. Our distracted human nerves call for a purpose, larger than that which castes and communities provide, a purpose which will release us from our pettiness. Bearing ourselves humbly before God, conscious that we serve an unfolding purpose, let us brace ourselves to the task and so bear ourselves in this great hour of our history as worthy servants of the ageless spirit of India.

sarvabhūtastham ātmānam sarvabhūtāni cātmani
saṁpaśyan ātmayājī vai svārājyam adhigacchati.

Index

EAST AND WEST

Some Reflections

Demy 8vo. Cloth 10s. 6d. net. Paper 6s. net.

In his Sir Edward Beatty Memorial Lectures delivered at McGill University Radhakrishnan makes one of his most impressive contributions in his role of unofficial "ambassador" between East and West. With characteristic lucidity he compares the eastern and western attitudes to history, religion and philosophy.

He first sketches in masterly fashion the development of Indian religion and philosophy, from the early days of the Indus civilization more than four thousand years ago, and emphasises the extent to which the basic Indian religion ignores differences of race, colour and language.

In the second Lecture he outlines the historical development of Judaism and Christianity, suggesting that at several periods there must have been close relationship between these churches and those of India, since several of the basic parts of the Creed are essentially the same.

In his third Lecture he analyses the present philosophies of the Western world against the historical background of the two earlier Lectures. Dr. Radhakrishnan stresses the fact that communism is a barren Western emasculation of the great creeds of East and West. He ends his penetrating study with a moving insistence upon the essential verities of religious thought that are shared by Christianity and the old Eastern religions.

Printed in Great Britain

Also by SIR S. RADHAKRISHNAN

THE HINDU VIEW OF LIFE

Seventh impression. Crown 8vo. 9s. 6d. net.

"A most attractive and a really important book written with delightful lucidity and with real charm of style. It should be widely read. A brilliant book and represents the beginning of a movement within Hinduism which may have important developments."—DR. MACNICOL in *The National Christian Council Review*.

"The most reliable and accurate presentation of the modern Hindu mind in religion and, incidentally, on social life also. We heartily commend Professor Radhakrishnan's book, both to Hindu and non-Hindu readers, as the best book we have so far come across on the Hindu view of life in our time."—*Indian Social Reformer*.

INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

In two volumes. Revised 2nd Edition. Demy 8vo. 63s. net. per set.

"An excellent book upon which author, editor and publisher are to be heartily congratulated. Professor Radhakrishnan has treated a great subject with admirable clarity and excellent judgment. He has given us an interpretation of Indian thought and aspiration that is vivid, vital, gripping."—*Journal of Philosophy*.

"Very interesting, lucid and admirably written book."—MISS EVELYN UNDERHILL in *Daily News*.

"The work is admirably done."—BERTRAND RUSSELL in *The Nation*.

"The works of Deussen and Max Müller are more histories than expositions of the systems. This is the first time that an Indian philosopher, well equipped in European philosophy has tried to present to the modern world the thoughts of the ancient Indian philosophers in a systematic way."—*Theosophist*.

AN IDEALIST VIEW OF LIFE

2nd Edition. Fourth impression. Demy 8vo. 15s. net

"I consider the book to be one of the most original and significant contributions to modern thought. Personally, I am deeply grateful for the benefit I have derived from the beauty and lucidity as well as the wide range of its philosophical insight."—RABINDRANATH TAGORE.

"Professor Radhakrishnan possesses the rare gift of being able to make righteousness readable, and I know of no work which, while so fairly and crisply presenting the modern criticism of religion, presents also with such an eloquence of passionate conviction the modern reply. The result is one of the most profoundly moving religious books of our time."—C. E. M. JOAD in *The Spectator*.

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD